



## Techniques and Protocols for Dispersing Nanoparticle Powders in Aqueous Media—is there a Rationale for Harmonization?

Hartmann, Nanna B.; Jensen, Keld Alstrup; Baun, Anders; Rasmussen, Kirsten; Rauscher, Hubert; Tantra, Ratna; Cupi, Denisa; Gilliland, Douglas; Pianella, Francesca; Riego Sintes, Juan M.

*Published in:*

Journal of Toxicology and Environmental Health. Part B: Critical Reviews

*Link to article, DOI:*

[10.1080/10937404.2015.1074969](https://doi.org/10.1080/10937404.2015.1074969)

*Publication date:*

2015

*Document Version*

Peer reviewed version

[Link back to DTU Orbit](#)

*Citation (APA):*

Hartmann, N. B., Jensen, K. A., Baun, A., Rasmussen, K., Rauscher, H., Tantra, R., Cupi, D., Gilliland, D., Pianella, F., & Riego Sintes, J. M. (2015). Techniques and Protocols for Dispersing Nanoparticle Powders in Aqueous Media—is there a Rationale for Harmonization? *Journal of Toxicology and Environmental Health. Part B: Critical Reviews*, 18(6), 299-326. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10937404.2015.1074969>

---

### General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



# Techniques and protocols for dispersing nanoparticle powders in aqueous media – is there a rational for harmonization?

Journal:	<i>Journal of Toxicology and Environmental Health, Part B: Critical Reviews</i>
Manuscript ID:	UTEB-2015-0009.R1
Manuscript Type:	Review
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	Hartmann, Nanna; Technical University of Denmark, Department of Environmental Engineering Jensen, Keld; The National Research Centre for the Working Environment, Baun, Anders; Technical University of Denmark, Department of Environmental Engineering Rasmussen, Kirsten; European Commission - Joint Research Centre, Institute for Health and Consumer Protection Rauscher, Hubert; European Commission - Joint Research Centre, Institute for Health and Consumer Protection Tantra, Ratna; National Physical Laboratory, Cupi, Denisa; Technical University of Denmark, Department of Environmental Engineering Gilliland, Douglas; European Commission - Joint Research Centre, Institute for Health and Consumer Protection Pianella, Francesca; European Commission - Joint Research Centre, Institute for Health and Consumer Protection Riego Sintes, Juan; European Commission - Joint Research Centre, Institute for Health and Consumer Protection
Keywords:	nanomaterials, harmonization, dispersion, OECD, test protocols

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

**Techniques and protocols for dispersing nanoparticle powders in aqueous media – is there a rational for harmonization?**

Nanna B. Hartmann<sup>1,2\*</sup>, Keld Alstrup Jensen<sup>3</sup>, Anders Baun<sup>1</sup>, Kirsten Rasmussen<sup>2</sup>, Hubert Rauscher<sup>2</sup>, Ratna Tantra<sup>4</sup>, Denisa Cupi<sup>1</sup>, Douglas Gilliland<sup>2</sup>, Francesca Pianella<sup>2</sup>, Juan M. Riego Sintes<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Technical University of Denmark (DTU), Department of Environmental Engineering, Miljøvej, DK-2800 Kgs. Lyngby, Denmark.

<sup>2</sup>European Commission - Joint Research Centre, Via E. Fermi, 21027 Ispra, Italy

<sup>3</sup>The National Research Centre for the Working Environment (NRCWE), Lersø Park Allé 105, DK-2100 Copenhagen Oe, Denmark

<sup>4</sup>National Physical Laboratory (NPL), Hampton Road, Teddington, Middlesex TW11 0LW, United Kingdom

\*Corresponding author. Current affiliation: DTU Envronnement, Miljøvej, DK-2800 Kgs. Lyngby, Denmark. Email: [nibh@env.dtu.dk](mailto:nibh@env.dtu.dk)

1  
2  
3  
4 1 ABSTRACT  
5

6 2 Appropriate ways of bringing engineered nanoparticles (ENP) into aqueous dispersion is a main  
7  
8 3 obstacle for testing and thus for understanding and evaluating their potential adverse effects to the  
9  
10 4 environment and human health. Using different methods to prepare (stock) dispersions of same  
11  
12 5 ENP may be a source of variation in the toxicity measured. Harmonization and standardization of  
13  
14 6 dispersion methods applied in mammalian and ecotoxicity testing are needed to ensure a  
15  
16 7 comparable data quality and to minimize test artefacts produced by modifications of ENP during the  
17  
18 8 dispersion preparation process. Such harmonization and standardization will also enhance  
19  
20 9 comparability between tests, labs and studies on different types of ENP. The scope of this review  
21  
22 10 was to critically discuss the essential parameters in dispersion protocols for ENP. The parameters  
23  
24 11 are identified from individual scientific studies and from consensus reached in larger-scale research  
25  
26 12 projects and international organizations. A step-wise approach is proposed to develop tailored  
27  
28 13 dispersion protocols for ecotoxicological and mammalian toxicological testing of ENP. The  
29  
30 14 recommendations of this analysis may serve as a guide to researchers, companies, and regulators  
31  
32 15 when selecting, developing and evaluating the appropriateness of dispersion methods applied in  
33  
34 16 mammalian and ecotoxicity testing. However, additional experimentation is needed to further  
35  
36 17 document the protocol parameters and investigate to what extent different stock dispersion methods  
37  
38 18 affect ecotoxicological and mammalian toxicological responses of ENP.  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

INTRODUCTION

The amount of information in literature on health and environmental safety of engineered nanoparticles (ENP) is steadily increasing. However, guidance is lacking on appropriate ways of performing tests with ENP in biological test systems (referring to toxicological or ecotoxicological tests using whole organisms or cells to determine potential adverse effects, here both are described as (eco)toxicity) and subsequently interpreting the results. This remains a barrier for understanding and evaluating potential adverse effects of ENP to humans and the environment. The lack of guidance is related to a limited understanding of the dynamic and complex behavior of ENP in different testing matrices making it difficult to provide appropriate scientific advice on the best testing practices (Cupi et al., 2015; Magdolenova et al, 2012; Snyder-Talkington et al, 2012).

Tests for ecotoxicity and mammalian toxicity generally require the preparation of particle dispersions where solid particles are dispersed in liquid media. Dispersions of ENP have also gained high interest for dosing in animal screening studies and for providing better control of the delivered dose as well as a faster and less expensive test procedure (Roursgaard et al., 2010). Testing dispersions of different concentrations are typically prepared by adding aliquots of a stock dispersion into a test medium. Unless the test substance is provided by the producer/supplier in the form of a stable stock dispersion, a stock dispersion will have to be prepared by dispersing the dry powder into a suitable dispersion medium. It has previously been shown that different suspension preparation methods can influence toxicity outcomes in ecotoxicity tests (Handy et al., 2008; Jo et al., 2012) and human toxicity tests where dispersion status plays a critical role for example in the fibrogenicity of single-walled carbon nanotubes (SWCNT) in human lung fibroblasts (Wang et al 2010b). It should be mentioned that, even if dispersion status is successfully controlled, other factors, such as administration route and adsorption affinity of the ENP to biomolecules and cell surfaces, is likely to cause variations in toxicity test outcomes. For example, differences in

toxicokinetics were observed between dietary and intravenous exposure of ZnO ENP in rats (Choi et al., 2015) as well as between dietary and aqueous exposure in zebrafish (Skjolding et al., 2014). Also, adsorption of ENP onto cells and biomolecules was found to be variable depending on ENP type (Hartmann et al., 2014; Lee et al., 2015).

Many ENP powders are not easily dispersed in aqueous media and their tendency to form agglomerates is a complicating factor which must be tackled in the preparation of stable stock dispersions. Dispersibility may be improved by adjustment of pH and/or ionic strengths or addition of solvents or dispersants combined with a de-agglomeration energy using various procedures for ultrasonication, stirring, or shaking (OECD, 2012; Jensen et al., 2014; Cupi, 2015). Once nanoparticle (NP) dispersion has been prepared its stability depends, among other things, on parameters related to the type of dispersion achieved, such as electrostatic, steric, polymeric or electrosteric, and the suspended particle concentration (Jensen et al., 2014).

Farré et al. (2009) and Godymchuk et al. (2011) provided an overview of some of the advantages and limitations of different dispersion preparation methods including mechanical, ultrasonication and chemical processes such as stirring or addition of dispersants. Based upon the evidence it is apparent that the choice of dispersion preparation method is often a trade-off between dispersion stability and risk of influencing test outcomes by introduction of toxic additives or changes to particle characteristics inducing significant or unknown changes in reactivity, solubility, and toxicity (Handy et al. 2008b; 2012a). . These possible testing artefacts may in part be responsible for the diverse results for biological effects. A well-known example is the false-positive inflammatory effects of fullerenes in the brain of juvenile sea-bass (Oberdörster, 2004). Effects were since attributed to  $\gamma$ -butyrolactone, a highly toxic oxidation product of tetrahydrofurene (TFH) that was used as a dispersant in the preparation of fullerene dispersions (Henry et al. 2007). More

1  
2  
3  
4 68 recently Menard et al. (2011) reviewed the literature on in vivo ecotoxicity of titanium dioxide  
5  
6 69 (TiO<sub>2</sub>) ENP and observed large variations which could not be clearly attributed to differences in test  
7  
8 70 species or particle characteristics. It may be speculated that dispersion preparation methods might  
9  
10 71 also play a role in this observed scatter in ecotoxicological effects of TiO<sub>2</sub> (Hartmann, 2011). Thus,  
11  
12 72 appropriate ways of bringing ENPs into dispersion is a critical and intensely debated topic in the  
13  
14 73 scientific literature, research projects and international organizations such as the Organization for  
15  
16 74 Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), National Institute of Standards and Technology  
17  
18 75 (NIST) and International Organization for Standardization (ISO).

21  
22 76 Identification and further development of appropriate dispersion protocols is important both  
23  
24 77 from a scientific and a regulatory point of view. Stock dispersion methods should ideally increase  
25  
26 78 both accuracy and precision when adverse effects of ENP are tested by 1) minimizing artefacts  
27  
28 79 produced by undesirable modifications of the ENP, 2) facilitating a link between observed effects  
29  
30 80 and the physico-chemical properties of pristine ENP and 3) producing sufficiently stable and  
31  
32 81 homogenous stock dispersions that enable precise and representative sampling when diluted into  
33  
34 82 test dispersions also referred to as working dispersions. Harmonization of dispersion protocols  
35  
36 83 signifies consistency between dispersion procedures and serves to minimize variations between  
37  
38 84 testing systems, labs and nanomaterials. Finally, adherence to a validated technical guidance  
39  
40 85 document for dispersion protocols infers that quality and validity criteria can be established with  
41  
42 86 regard to stock dispersion stability and state of dispersion.

46 87 Several protocols for preparation of dispersions of ENP for toxicity testing have already been  
47  
48 88 proposed through research projects such as ENPRA (Jacobsen, 2010) PROSPECt (PROSPECt,  
49  
50 89 2010), NANOGENOTOX (Jensen et al, 2011a), and NANOMMUNE (Nanommune, 2011) as well  
51  
52 90 as organizations and institutes for guidance and standardized methods, such as NIST and the Center  
53  
54 91 for the Environmental Implications of NanoTechnology (CEINT) (Taurozzi et al 2012a; 2012b;

2012c; 2012d; 2013). Current protocols, as listed above and in Table 1, represent a development and refinement in dispersion methods over the last years as knowledge on ENP behavior and transformations during the different steps of dispersion has emerged. Hence, increasing focus is being placed on appropriate ways of dispersion ENP without altering the particle properties or creating test artefacts. However, the current protocols are limited in scope by being focused on specific test types such as *in vitro* testing and/or certain ENP, and may have been optimized according to specific criteria including dispersion stability and/or particle size distribution. This limitation in scope may in some cases limit the direct applicability of existing protocols to other test systems and their applicability to other ENP types. At the same time different labs may have different 'traditions' for using specific dispersion media and procedures, which are likely to be adapted to the specific purpose of the study and availability of equipment combined with past practice. Labs may wish to adhere to already applied procedures for the sake of internal comparability. However, this may limit inter-lab comparisons.

From a regulatory point of view, harmonization and standardization of protocols and methods applied in (eco)toxicity testing is needed to ensure repeatability and reproducibility as well as a comparable high quality of data, resulting in data upon which classification, labelling, and hazard assessments can be based. The OECD plays a key role in the international harmonization of regulatory guidelines for testing of chemicals (OECD, 2013). The agreement on mutual acceptance of data (MAD), aimed at reducing testing efforts (OECD, 1981), is based on such harmonization. Within the OECD Working Party on Manufactured Nanomaterials (WPMN) work is ongoing on issues related to testing of nanomaterials, with one output being a "Guidance on Sample Preparation and Dosimetry for the Safety Testing of Manufactured Nanomaterials" (GSPD) (OECD, 2012). This guidance has a generic nature and outlines considerations relevant to physicochemical characterization and biological tests based on available scientific knowledge. The lack of specific



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

116 guidance is explained by the fact that "...best methods for sample preparation, dosimetry, and  
117 safety testing do not yet have full consensus within the field..."(OECD, 2012). An OECD WPMN  
118 expert meeting on ecotoxicology and environmental fate was held in Berlin in January 2013 to  
119 discuss the applicability and further development of OECD test guidelines and guidance documents  
120 for nanomaterials. One recommendation from the meeting was to amend the OECD GSPD to  
121 include more detailed information on stock dispersion preparation (Kühnel & Nickel 2014). For all  
122 guidance update and development, the current challenge is to integrate the state-of-the art scientific  
123 knowledge on dispersion techniques with the regulatory requirements for a harmonized approach.

124 The initial stock dispersion preparation is identified as a fundamental step in obtaining  
125 meaningful results in subsequent (eco)toxicity testing. Therefore, the present study aimed to  
126 contribute to development of appropriate protocols for preparation of aqueous stock dispersions of  
127 ENP powders. This was achieved through a critical review of 5 available dispersion protocols from  
128 NANOGENOTOX, PROSPECt, NANOMMUNE, ENPRA and NIST/CEINT. Basis upon our  
129 observations key steps in the in dispersion procedures were identified. Combined with a review of  
130 published scientific papers this provided background knowledge in a subsequent discussion on how  
131 these parameters influence the resulting (eco)toxicity and dispersion characteristics. Special  
132 emphasis was placed on sonication procedures and parameters as these were identified as a key step  
133 in the dispersion preparation. This investigation was undertaken to identify research and  
134 documentation needs and potential areas of harmonization for the preparation of stable aqueous  
135 stock dispersions from powders of ENP. The provided information is intended to minimize the risk  
136 that the preparation methods produce undesirable modifications of ENP by inducing testing  
137 artefacts. The subsequent dilution and characterization in testing media is addressed when relevant,  
138 but a detailed description hereof is outside the main scope of this review (for additional information  
139 on this the reader is referred to Jensen et al. 2014; Seitz et al. 2013; Handy et al. 2012a; 2012b).

With the proposal of a tailored dispersion protocol this investigation is intended as a starting point for development of a guidance document on stock dispersion protocols for (eco)toxicological testing assisting the production of reliable and reproducible (eco)toxicity data for MAD purposes under the Globally Harmonized System of Classification and Labelling of Chemicals (GHS) (in Europe this corresponds to the REACH (EC, 2006) and CLP (EC, 2008) regulations, respectively).

## **STOCK DISPERSION PREPARATION – REVIEW OF KEY PARAMETERS**

### **Case study protocols: overview, commonalities and differences**

For the purpose of this review 5 specific dispersion protocols were selected as case studies. An overview of these is provided in Table 1. Although the protocols vary greatly in some parameter values, the parameters listed are comparable. Based on information in the protocols, the following parameters were identified as key considerations in a stock dispersion preparation protocol:

- I) ENP properties
- II) ENP stock concentrations
- III) Volume of dispersion medium
- IV) Dispersion media / water quality
- V) Stabilizing / dispersing agents
- VI) Pre-wetting of ENP powders
- VII) Dispersion procedure (mechanical and ultrasonication)
- VIII) Temperature control
- IX) Maintaining stability prior to dosing
- X) Performance or quality assurance

All of these parameters are described for the individual protocols in Table 1 below and frame the discussions and recommendations in the remaining part of this review. Additional critical

1

2

3

4164 parameters, not listed in Table 1, include the type of vials, immersion depth of the sonifier in probe

5

6165 dispersion protocols and position of vials in the case of ultrasound bath sonicators. Moreover, the

7

8166 importance of considering the *sequence* of dispersion preparation steps was pointed out by Byrne et

9

10167 al. (2010).

11

12

13168

14

15169 **Considerations related to nanomaterial properties**

16

17170 An initial step in any dispersion preparation is a consideration of the specific properties of the

18

19171 ENP to be dispersed. Basic information on the physicochemical properties needs to be obtained by

20

21172 compiling existing data from the producers' technical data sheets and verifying and supplementing

22

23173 this information by additional physicochemical characterization as relevant. The required

24

25174 information includes information on particle composition, chemical surface properties, water

26

27175 solubility and hydrophobicity. Finally, morphological characterization of the aggregate size (-

28

29176 distribution) and types of agglomerates in the ENP powder is valuable for setting expectations for

30

31177 hydrodynamic size-distributions in dispersion. The dispersibility of ENP depends on the

32

33178 mechanisms underlying agglomeration in the ENP powder, which often occurs due to electrostatic

34

35179 forces. Other agglomeration mechanisms include physical interlock, electric, magnetic, and soft

36

37180 bridging (Schneider & Jensen 2009; Jensen et al., 2014). ENP agglomerated due to specific

38

39181 subcategories such as entanglement, bridging due to organic coatings and stickiness, and

40

41182 ferromagnetic properties may be particularly difficult to disperse as compared to the typically

42

43183 considered van der Waals forces. In such cases, acceptance of larger agglomerates in the dispersion

44

45184 may be necessary as separation into single particles or primary aggregates may not be feasible and

46

47185 agglomeration is inevitable.

48

49

50

51

52

53186 The protocols reviewed in the present study have been documented mainly for metal oxides

54

55187 (cerium oxide (CeO<sub>2</sub>), zinc oxide (ZnO), TiO<sub>2</sub> and silicon dioxide (SiO<sub>2</sub>)) although three also apply

56

57

58

59

60

(one with adaptations) to carbon nanotubes (CNT), one to silver (Ag) Ag ENP and one to iron (Fe) ENP. On an operational level, ENP with similar surface characteristics may in principle be dispersed using the same procedure. This means that if a dispersion method has already been applied to one hydrophilic ENP it may also be appropriate to other hydrophilic ENP. What is understood by 'similar' is largely a matter of interpretation, and is also related to the broader on-going discussions on grouping of nanomaterials which is needed for testing, risk assessment and 'safety-by-design' purposes. In this regard, it is important to note that grouping based on chemical composition like metal oxides, metals, and carbon-containing nanomaterials will not necessarily be operational for identification of appropriate dispersion protocols. For example uncoated ZnO, SiO<sub>2</sub> and TiO<sub>2</sub> ENPs typically have iso-electric points around neutral, acidic and acidic/neutral pH levels, respectively (Komulski, 2009), resulting in highly different dispersibility and stability in pure water systems, when no additional steps are taken to stabilize the dispersion. These differences may be more pronounced in pure water compared to biological media. A range of metal oxide ENP, with varying zeta potential in deionized water ranging from -29.2 mV to 57.2 mV, displayed similar very similar zeta potentials ranging from -26.6 mV to -19.8 mV in cell medium containing 5% fetal bovine serum (Lee et al., 2015). Hence, depending on the stock dispersion media composition, differences in zeta potential and stability between different ENP may even out.

#### **Concentrations of ENP in stock dispersions**

The required ENP concentration in stock dispersions is likely to vary with the intended use. Ecotoxicologists add aliquots of stock dispersion into synthetic aquatic environmental media, whereas toxicologists prepare test dispersions cell media or perform *in vivo* studies using lung instillation, ingestion, and intravenous injection. These different exposure methods may require different minimum concentrations in the stock dispersion. Conversely an upper limit for stock

1  
2  
3  
4 212 concentrations may be determined by concentrations at which extensive agglomeration occurs for  
5  
6 213 specific ENP and medium. In the evaluated dispersion protocols presented in Table 1 the stock  
7  
8 214 dispersion concentrations varied from 0.015 to 20 g/L. The NIST protocol prescribed concentrations  
9  
10 215 from 0.5 – 20 g/L (Taurozzi et al, 2012c) with subsequent dilution to achieve test dispersions of 0.1  
11  
12 216 g/L in phosphate buffered saline solution (PBS) and Dulbecco's Modified Eagle Medium containing  
13  
14 217 10 % fetal bovine serum (DMEM-FBS) (Taurozzi et al, 2012d) or synthetic environmental medium  
15  
16 218 (Taurozzi et al, 2013). The NANOGENOTOX and ENPRA protocols prescribe a stock  
17  
18 219 concentration of 2.56 g/L, whereas the concentrations in the NANOMMUNE and PROSPeCT  
19  
20 220 protocols are particle-dependent and vary from 0.015 g/L (CeO<sub>2</sub>, PROSPeCT) and 0.25 g/L (CNT  
21  
22 221 in the NANOMMUNE protocol) to 1 g/L (general concentration in the NANOMMUNE protocol)  
23  
24 222 and 2.56 g/L (for coated ZnO, in the PROSPeCT protocol). The 2.56 g/L in the ENPRA protocol,  
25  
26 223 and since adopted in the NANOGENOTOX and PROSPeCT protocols, were selected based on (1)  
27  
28 224 dose requirements from the toxicologists and (2) to obtain a simple dilution scheme for *in vitro*  
29  
30 225 toxicological dosing without diluting the test medium significantly while at the same time enabling  
31  
32 226 direct instilling or injection of sufficiently low volumes in test animals.

33  
34  
35  
36  
37 227 Increasing the material concentrations in dispersions enhances the likelihood of collision,  
38  
39 228 agglomeration and aggregation. Agglomerates are clusters of weakly bound particles, which may be  
40  
41 229 separated again, whereas aggregates consist of strongly bonded or fused primary particles (ISO,  
42  
43 230 2008). Hence, if aggregation (irreversible process) occurs in the stock dispersions no subsequent  
44  
45 231 steps in the dispersion preparation procedure are successful in separating the aggregates and this  
46  
47 232 ultimately results in testing of large particle aggregates rather than smaller (primary) particles.

48  
49 233 Since the critical maximum concentration that induces agglomeration depends on the ENP  
50  
51 234 properties such as whether they are charged/uncharged, hydrophilic, hydrophobic, magnetic,  
52  
53 235 conductive, soluble/insoluble, initially aggregated or agglomerated and the type of stabilization  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

236 such as electrostatic, steric or electrosteric, it is necessary to consider the critical concentrations for  
237 agglomeration with respect to the specific ENP to be dispersed. In a generic dispersion protocol the  
238 fixed ENP concentration may exceed the particle saturation level for some ENP, and therefore  
239 represents a trade-off when using generic dispersion protocols with fixed conditions. To counteract  
240 concentration-induced agglomeration one can either try to adjust the preparation techniques and  
241 ratios between ENP and dispersants as illustrated by modifications of the NANOGENOTOX  
242 dispersion protocol (Guiot and Spalla, 2012). The use of dispersants will be discussed further later.

243 The relationship between concentration and aggregation in stock dispersions was investigated  
244 for TiO<sub>2</sub> (NM-105) by Tantra et al. (2014). This study investigated the influence on the final TiO<sub>2</sub>  
245 dispersion properties as a result of systematic changes in different steps within one dispersion  
246 protocol (e.g. dispersion ageing, sonication time (20 sec – 15 min), sonication power (in W), pulsed  
247 operation mode, amplitude, sonication in the presence/absence of an ice bath, material subsampling,  
248 particle concentration). It was concluded that TiO<sub>2</sub> particle concentration in the stock dispersion  
249 was the most influencing factor for dispersion properties. Six concentrations were tested, ranging  
250 from 0.015 to 2.6 g/l and a concentration-dependent shift in particle size distributions was observed  
251 with higher particle concentrations resulting in a greater degree of aggregation/agglomeration.  
252 Studies by Hartmann et al. (2012) and Ji et al. (2010) found that dispersions of TiO<sub>2</sub> (P25 Evonik)  
253 ENP in ultrapure water prepared by ultrasonication were stable for minimum of 6 and 24 hr  
254 respectively at particle concentrations of 2-100 mg/L as evaluated by visual inspections, UV-Vis,  
255 DLS, and zeta potential. Previously Tantra et al (2010) noted a relationship between particle  
256 concentration, zeta potential and stability of ENP systems for multi-walled carbon nanotubes  
257 (MWCNT), gold and silica ENP. The samples used were commercially bought (highly stable)  
258 colloidal suspensions; the dispersion medium of the gold nanoparticles was not specified by the  
259 supplier (Tantra et al., 2010), whereas the other three were suspended in deionized water based

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

media. The study reported that there is a distinctive region (referred to as the ‘stable region’) in the plots of zeta-potential versus particle concentration, in which the zeta-potential value is independent of nanoparticle concentration. Results from the study showed that all samples were highly stable, as indicated by their large negative zeta-potential values, with average mean ranging from – 43 to - 56 mV. The average standard deviation of measurement within the stable region was reported to be within +/-4 mV; it was only at extreme dilutions (referred to as the ‘unstable region’) that the mean value of the zeta-potential changed. The 'stable region' for hydrodynamic diameter and zeta potential with a lower limit for particle concentration between  $10^{-4}$  and  $10^{-2}$  wt% depending on particle type (corresponding to approximately 0.1-10 g/L). Clearly, it was not the intent of such studies to give specific recommendations on particle concentrations, as case-specific interplay between concentrations, ionic strength, stabilizing agents, pH, has to be taken into account. However, such studies are indicative of how easy it is to vary dispersion quality as a result of small changed made to the protocol e.g. particle concentration.

The resulting hydrodynamic size in the stock dispersions and in test media is not only relevant for having control of the initial exposure characteristics, but also for potential mechanisms and observed biological effects (Jensen et al., 2014). In ecotoxicological tests greater toxicity was observed for Ag and Au ENP when they were less agglomerated in a diluted exposure medium for *D. magna* (Römer et al., 2013) and zebra fish embryos (Truong et al., 2012). As lower ENP concentrations and lower ionic strength of the media is likely to causes less agglomeration it is therefore plausible that a higher relative toxicity may be observed at lower particle concentrations in low ionic strength media (Baun et al., 2008; Römer et al., 2013; Cupi, 2015). The agglomeration and aggregation state in the stock dispersion is therefore crucial for subsequent exposure and effects in (eco) toxicological testing. Data suggest that sufficiently stable stock dispersions often can only be prepared at concentrations in the mg/L range if made in de-ionized water. Assuming that fully

dispersed ENP powders are a worst case scenario for hazard testing, the stock concentrations need to ideally be as low as possible to avoid/minimize particle agglomeration and as close to the highest tested concentration as possible without producing artefacts due to dilution of test media. However, 'stable' non-agglomerating particle concentration regions need to be established on a case-by-case basis. If dispersions are prepared using stabilizing agents and/or pH/ion-strength optimization, then sufficiently stable dispersions may be made for notably higher concentrations. Achieving a good dispersion at the highest possible concentrations would naturally be facilitated by tailoring each medium and preparation technique for the specific ENP. However, such an approach does not result in harmonization. Although pure water could often be the immediate preferred choice of medium, it may not enable the required doses for neither *in vitro* nor *in vivo* toxicological testing.

#### **Pre-wetting of ENP powders**

Hydrophobic ENP present a challenge in the preparation of aquatic dispersions. A 'pre-wetting' step is included in some dispersion procedures to facilitate dispersions of these ENP. The hydrophobicity of a ENP may either stem from surface chemistry such as coatings or functionalization or from its inherent atomic surface structure such as honeycomb structure of carbon nanotubes (CNT) and is generally enhanced by nano-scale surface roughness (Li et al., 2002).

A pre-wetting step (i.e. making a paste of the powder ENP by mixing it with a liquid) is prescribed in many of the reviewed dispersion protocols. Pre-wetting has the purpose to overcome the hydrophobicity of the 'native' ENP by changing its surface properties. In the PROSPeCT protocol pre-wetting with DI water is recommended for CeO<sub>2</sub>. This procedure might be advantageous for ENP, which are hydrophilic, but appear as dense agglomerates, or form soft bridging, or have large and maybe even reactive surface areas. In these cases, increased dispersion



1  
2  
3  
4 308 may possibly be reached by increasing reaction time with water before sonication. In other  
5  
6 309 reviewed protocols the pre-wetting is undertaken with a 0.5 vol% ethanol solution (Table 1).  
7  
8 310 Different techniques, water and/or solvents might be applied depending upon the material. The  
9  
10 311 purpose in the initial step is to assist de-agglomeration of specific ENP. This process may require a  
11  
12 312 hydrophilic solvent and/or a solvent with a lower surface tension compared to that of water. The  
13  
14 313 surface tension of ethanol is  $\sigma=0.02$  N/m as compared to that of water 0.07 N/m and ethanol is also  
15  
16 314 hydrophilic. General use of ethanol would therefore in general improve the initial dispersion of both  
17  
18 315 agglomerates and hydrophilic compounds. When subsequently dispersed in water the pre-wetted  
19  
20 316 particles may be more easily dispersed, and ethanol can be evaporated if sufficient heating,  
21  
22 317 sonication or time is applied. However, if evaporation is incomplete, the presence of ethanol in the  
23  
24 318 dispersion might potentially affect subsequent experimental results by producing adverse effects  
25  
26 319 on the test organisms (Caro & Cederbaum, 2004; Brown & Brown, 2012). To prevent this it is thus  
27  
28 320 important to ensure proper evaporation of the solvent.  
29  
30  
31

32  
33 321 In the ENPRA protocol pre-wetting is applied as a standard procedure for ZnO ENP,  
34  
35 322 independently of hydrophobicity of the tested ENP, for the sake of full comparability in  
36  
37 323 comparative testing. In the more generic NANOGENOTOX dispersion protocol it is applied to all  
38  
39 324 ENP to ensure full comparability across a wider set of test materials. This represents a trade-off  
40  
41 325 between comparability and minimizing modifications of test material and thereby potential  
42  
43 326 artefacts. It may, however, be a necessary inclusion for harmonization across different ENP.  
44  
45

46 327 It is still difficult to conclude whether general pre-wetting using chemicals other than water  
47  
48 328 should be recommended for harmonized dispersion protocols. The critical issues are whether the  
49  
50 329 chemical used for pre-wetting significantly changes relevant physicochemical ENP properties or the  
51  
52 330 compound in itself or by degradation products may induce important biological side-effects. For the  
53  
54 331 0.05 vol% ethanol concentrations used in the ENPRA, NANOGENOTOX and PROSPECt, such  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

effects are still not observed or reported. One could decide, as in the ENPRA procedure, that pre-wetting is only applied when necessary. In any case it is important, and already normally applied in toxicological studies, to include media control to incorporate such effects into account. This procedure, however, does not enable control over potential changes to the test material where a specific concern would be changes in chemical surface coatings.

### **Dispersion medium composition**

Given the diversity of aquatic media that can be used for dispersion preparation, specification of the individual ingredients in the stock dispersion media and their qualities is a key for harmonization. Media composition is known to influence ENP behavior in a complex manner, for example as a result of ion composition and ionic strength (Ottofuelling et al., 2011). The requirements for a stock dispersion media include (1) simplicity for predictability of particle behavior, and (2) compatibility with biological assays. As the stock dispersion is subsequently diluted into a test media or test matrix the stock dispersion media does not need to contain the nutrients necessary for survival of the test organisms. However, the constituents of the stock media should not have a negative biological effect.

Pure water was selected as the foundation in all reviewed protocols presented in Table 1. The two main criteria are specified with regards to purity, as determined by resistivity, and bacterial contamination as indicated by the presence of endotoxins. The resistivity criteria have been defined to ensure high purity of the water as water-resistivity depends on its ion content. Higher ion content, caused by impurities, leads to a higher conductivity and hence lower resistivity. Water is considered pure when its resistivity is above 18.2 M $\Omega$ ·cm at 25°C. High purity water does usually not improve the dispersion of ENP, but is requested to avoid unpredicted/uncontrolled variations in stability and toxicological effects due to variable water chemistry.

1  
2  
3  
4 356 Microbial purity is another highly important criterion in dispersion protocols. Bacterial  
5  
6 357 contamination, or presence of other bio-colloids, may be a critical factor in ENP dispersion, due to  
7  
8 358 the potential hetero-aggregation of particles and bacteria (Hotze et al., 2010), production of  
9  
10 359 exudates, and biological degradation of organic surface coatings , which in turn affect dispersion  
11  
12 360 properties. However, more importantly for toxicological testing, presence of bacteria might initiate  
13  
14 361 strong toxicological responses. The reviewed protocols (Table 1) specify the absence of bacterial  
15  
16 362 contamination which is indicated by the concentration of lipopolysaccharides / endotoxins as given  
17  
18 363 in EU/ml , where 1 EU/ml is approximately 0.1-0.2 ng endotoxin/ml (Ryan, 2004). It should be  
19  
20 364 noted that, while bacterial and other microbial contamination may be removed by filtration,  
21  
22 365 endotoxins could still be present and would require additional treatment. Some protocols provide  
23  
24 366 specific limit values for levels of lipopolysaccharides / endotoxins in water. Three protocols  
25  
26 367 (ENPRA, NANOGENOTOX and PROSPeCT) prescribe filtration through a filter with a  $\leq 0.45 \mu\text{m}$   
27  
28 368 pore size, which is considered to retain microorganisms and produce sterile water. To reduce  
29  
30 369 changes in dispersion properties due to water chemistry or bacterial contamination, and to make  
31  
32 370 stock dispersion compatible with a subsequent use in a variety of biological tests, it is generally  
33  
34 371 recommended to use high quality, ultrapure water with a resistivity of above  $18.2 \text{ M}\Omega\cdot\text{cm}$  in ENP  
35  
36 372 stock dispersion protocols.

37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43 373 **pH and medium composition**

44  
45 374 ENP dispersions can also be stabilized through increasing the electrostatic stabilization as a  
46  
47 375 result of the charges from the electric double layer. These charges might either be negative or  
48  
49 376 positive, depending on the pH of the medium they are found in. There also exists a pH at which  
50  
51 377 these charges are neutral and this point is called the isoelectric point, or point of zero charge. It is  
52  
53 378 here where the electrostatic repulsion is non-existent and that ENP are more prone to  
54  
55 379 agglomeration. Therefore, pH is an important parameter in dispersion stability.

While various studies (Badawy et al., 2010; Domingos et al., 2013; Zhu et al., 2014) used the parameter of pH to stabilize suspensions in media, few studies employed pH to control dispersion of ENP stock suspensions for toxicological studies (Cupi, 2015), although similar principles apply. Stability of TiO<sub>2</sub> P25 ENP dispersed in high purity water water was assessed at pH 4, 6 and 8. The isoelectric point was around 5, and most stable suspensions with regards to particle sizes and zeta potential were those at pH 8, which was the furthest away from the isoelectric point (von der Krammer et al. 2010). Similar results were observed for TiO<sub>2</sub> P25 where the isoelectric point was around 6, when pH was adjusted to 3, 5.9, 7, 9 and 11. The smallest agglomerates occurred in pH 9 and 11 (Horst et al 2012). Cupi (2015) observed the stability of Ag, ZnO and TiO<sub>2</sub> ENP in high purity (MilliQ-filtered) water, Elendt M7 medium, Very soft (VS) EPA medium and Soft (S) EPA over pH values 2-12. For all three ENP, lowest sizes could be achieved in high purity water, but pH values where the suspensions were more stable depended upon the particle. Agglomeration increased with a rise in ionic strength of the media and was highest for Elendt M7 medium. For suspensions to be used for toxicological studies, Guiot and Spalla (2013) determined that measuring the isoelectric point of 4 different TiO<sub>2</sub> ENP is important, but in case of addition of a stabilizing agent, pH of that agent also needs to be taken into account. Addition of BSA at neutral pH might initiate rapid aggregation due to interactions of almost neutral ENP and negatively charged BSA.

Identification of the isoelectric point for the each suspension seems to be a fundamental step when preparing stock suspensions, allowing for an evaluation of particle behavior over a range of pH values and identification of most stable and physiologically relevant conditions.

#### **Ultrasonication procedure**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

The dispersion of dry ENP powder in aqueous medium is most often facilitated by sonication, applying sound energy with ultrasonic frequencies to the dispersion. Other methods include magnetic stirring, vortexing, and shaking. While these are less aggressive methods, they are also less efficient in dispersing ENP. A variety of sonicator types are available, which differ in efficiencies and in the manner in which energy is delivered to the sample. Some of the most common types are probe sonicators (direct), bath sonicators (indirect), and less commonly used cup horn sonicator. Some advantages and disadvantages of different sonication apparatus are summarized in Table 2. Sample contamination may occur when probe sonicating different samples consecutively or from trace metal release due to erosion of the probe tip (usually made from titanium). Using a silica (glass) probe tip (sonotrode) might reduce this risk. This, however, requires a reduced amplitude (IMLAB, 2013) and results in a reduction of delivered effective energy and sonication efficiency. It is also noteworthy that dispersion protocols specify careful cleaning of the probe-sonicator between samples and that the potential cross-contamination is low when the stock dispersion are present in g/L concentrations. A cross-contamination of 10 µg into 2.56 mg/ml in 6 ml would result in less than 0.065 wt% contamination, which usually would be further diluted in the experiment. Bath sonication, on the other hand, has a major drawback from a harmonization point of view, as it is practically impossible to accurately control the effective energy delivered to the sample as it is not delivered directly into the sonicated sample. The effective energy delivered to the sample is lower for bath sonicators compared to probe (and cup horn) sonicators, making them less efficient from a dispersibility point of view ( Jiang et al. 2009; Franklin et al. 2007; Caneba et al. 2010; Mejia et al. 2012).

In a sonication device the input power, i.e. the electrical energy consumed by the device, is converted to high frequency energy pulses usually given in Hz, number of pulses per sec, which is then transformed into mechanical vibrations as in a probe with a certain amplitude equal to the

distance of probe movement resulting in the formation of microscopic waves. This process results in an output of acoustic power (W) with an certain intensity ( $\text{W}/\text{cm}^2$ ) per ultrasonic source surface unit such as probe tip surface area (Capelo-Martínez, 2008). This can again be described as a local energy density ( $\text{W}\cdot\text{sec}/\text{ml}$ ), defined as "the amount of delivered energy per unit of suspension volume", meaning that at equal particle concentration and power, "higher energy densities (i.e., lower dispersion volumes) will result in a greater disruptive effect" (Taurozzi et al, 2012b). As indicated by Taurozzi et al. (2011) the efficiency of the energy transformation from the electrical input power to the acoustic power effectively received by the sonicated dispersion depend predominantly on the specific sonication device. Therefore, simply reporting the displayed input power and sonicator settings does not accurately reflect the actual energy delivered to the sample and hence accounting for lack of reproducible results (Taurozzi et al., 2011). However, as illustrated by the case studies presented in Table 1, sonication power, settings and probe dimensions are the parameters normally specified in the dispersion protocols considering that similar types of probe sonicator would be used. In reality many different types of sonicators are available in different probe designs, powers, frequencies, and range in amplitudes. The challenge is to develop a calibration method that is widely applicable. In preparation of the final NANOGENOTOX protocol, however, the consumed energy at the fixture was used for calibrating the delivered energy of different types of sonicators. The resulting average particle size was found to decrease as a power function of sonication time for all applied sonication instruments, resulting in comparable particle sizes at the same delivered energy (Jensen et al., 2011b).

Calibration of different probe sonicators is a key issue. Some probe sonicators read out the delivered energy dose given to the sample, but this feature is not available in all sonicators and data may not be directly comparable. Different methods exist to calculate the effective energy delivered to the sample including calorimetric methods based on temperature increase (Taurozzi et al., 2012b)

1  
2  
3  
4 450 and methods based on measured power consumption during working and no-load operation such as  
5  
6 451 sonication of dispersion and air, respectively (Bihari et al., 2008). In the ENPRA project  
7  
8 452 harmonization was attempted by using the same brand and make of sonicator. In the  
9  
10 453 NANOGENOTOX project different sonicators were used and calibrations were performed to  
11  
12 454 determine the amplitude and durations based on the consumed energy measured using a Watt-meter  
13  
14 455 at the wall-fixture combined with performance testing on an internal common material and  
15  
16 456 benchmark data on hydrodynamic size-distributions on all test materials (Jensen et al. 2011c). Other  
17  
18 457 and more specific methods for harmonization include measurement of the amount iodide to iodine  
19  
20 458 ( $E_0 = -0.615V$ ) conversion by oxidation according to the Weissler reaction during sonication.  
21  
22 459 However, this procedure also has some quantitative limitations due to sensitivity to temperature and  
23  
24 460 some reactivity without hydrodynamic cavitations (Morison and Hutchinson 2009), which need to  
25  
26 461 be understood with respect to specific use.

27  
28  
29  
30 462 Reproducibility in preparing ENP dispersions by sonication requires consistency at least in  
31  
32 463 effective energy delivered to the sample<sup>1</sup>, the vials used, temperature, medium viscosity, particle  
33  
34 464 concentration and sample/vessel volume. For probe sonication also the shape and diameter of the  
35  
36 465 probe, as well as probe immersion depth is important. Smaller sample vessel diameters and an  
37  
38 466 immersion depth of 2-5 cm was recommended for standard probes (Taurozzi et al., 2011). Based  
39  
40 467 upon existing data, it appears that comparable and reproducible results can be made using probe  
41  
42 468 sonication and that this is a practical, accessible and pragmatic choice for harmonization of  
43  
44 469 dispersion protocols, whilst acknowledging that further optimization and guidance is needed.

45  
46  
47  
48 470 To reach one or a set of harmonized dispersion protocols it is necessary to establish standard  
49  
50 471 procedures for determining and calibrating the specific delivered energy and de-agglomeration  
51  
52 472 efficiency of sonicators combined with a standardized reporting requirement. Development of such

53  
54  
55  
56  
57 <sup>1</sup> A sample is here defined as dispersion of nanomaterials including any additives  
58  
59  
60

a method for calibration, combined with detailed reporting of sonication procedure information, would greatly improve interpretability, comparability and reproducibility. As a starting point for reporting requirements the list of sonication parameters in (Taurozzi et al., 2011; 2012a) could be consulted, where the latter also includes more general reporting requirements for preparation of ENP dispersions.

During sonication the reactive species produced during cavitation and heating of the sample may directly produce modifications and degradation of ENP, dispersants, coatings and/or media components. Heating would have additional importance in evaporation if high energies or long sonication times are used. A cooling coil might be mounted in the bath sonicators water bath. For probe sonication cooling might be done by placing the sample in an ice-water bath (or ice-salt bath) (Table 1) which the transfer of heat (cooling of the sample) might be optimized by increasing the vessel wall-surface-to-volume ratio. In addition, pulsed mode sonication, in which the sonicator operates at alternated on/off intervals, might aid in minimizing heating of the sample and thus improve temperature control (Taurozzi et al, 2012b). However, this mode is not available in all sonicators, which has been a limiting factor in development of the procedures discussed here.

If the ENP dispersion is to be used in biological testing then knowledge of possible influences of sonication procedures on toxicity is of vital importance for interpretation of experimental results. As indicated by Taurozzi et al. (2011) sonication leads to formation of reactive species ('sonic activation') during cavitation. An increased toxicity of ENP dispersions after sonication may theoretically be explained by formation of radical species such as thermal dissociation of water into  $\bullet\text{OH}$  radicals and  $\bullet\text{H}$  atoms (Riesz and Kondo, 1992) and subsequent recombination into hydrogen peroxide (Brown and Goodman, 1965), which may interact with ENP and change its surface chemistry (Taurozzi et al. 2011). Oxidation is practically inevitable during sonication and may produce some limitations in testing acute effects of materials with elements in reduced state.



1  
2  
3  
4 497 Further, sonication may generate the formation of toxic degradation products of dispersants or other  
5  
6 498 media constituents (Wang et al., 2012), change surface coating chemistry (Taurozzi et al., 2011),  
7  
8 499 enhanced release of metal ions or increased toxicity due to smaller particle sizes (Cronholm et al.,  
9  
10 500 2011). A few studies compared the biological effects of ENP dispersions when prepared by use of  
11  
12 501 stirring, bath sonication and probe sonication (Table S1 in SI). The general trend is an enhanced  
13  
14 502 toxicity of bath and probe sonicated ENP dispersions compared to non-sonicated dispersions such  
15  
16 503 as stirred. However, as studies vary in test organism, test material as well as sonication type and  
17  
18 504 settings, such as frequency or time, it is not possible to make any direct comparison. Overall, due to  
19  
20 505 known possible sonication-induced modifications to ENP and their biological reactivity it is  
21  
22 506 recommended to only apply the minimum energy input required to obtain a disperse particle  
23  
24 507 dispersion.  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

31 509 **Dispersants**

32  
33 510 A challenge for accurate exposure and dosing in (eco)toxicological testing of dispersed ENP  
34  
35 511 powders is related to their different agglomeration and aggregation (or 'bundling' in the case of  
36  
37 512 CNT). In principle, the interactions between ENP in dispersion (or in general between two  
38  
39 513 interfaces in a dispersed system) may be described by the DVLO theory, named after Derjaguin,  
40  
41 514 Landau, Verwey, and Overbeek (Chen and Elimelech, 2007; Feiler et al., 2000). In brief, the overall  
42  
43 515 interaction energy between two interfaces is the net balance of the repulsive electrostatic Coulomb  
44  
45 516 (double layer interaction) forces and the attractive van der Waals forces. The overall force  
46  
47 517 determines whether ENP in aqueous media form stable dispersions or agglomerates (Salager, 1994).  
48  
49 518 In order for CNT bundling to occur strong van der Waals interactions are required along the tube  
50  
51 519 hampering their dispersibility (Edri and Regev, 2008). In order to enhance the dispersibility and  
52  
53 520 stability of ENP in aqueous media various dispersants might be added to overcome the attractive  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

forces through increased steric repulsion. A division may be made between natural dispersants including proteins and humic acids and synthetic dispersants such as poloxamers or other non-ionic surfactants (Handy et al., 2012a). When adding dispersants, modifications of biological response(s) is a general concern resulting from inherent toxicity or antioxidant properties of the surfactant as well as hampering the direct interactions between the ENP and biological surfaces. Wang et al. (2010a) noted a dispersant should not induce toxic effects in itself and at the same time neither mask nor enhance the biological activity of the ENP. Biological relevancy and testing regime are also important factors to consider. It is of interest that Thomas et al. (2011) reported that serum protein and natural organic matter (NOM) have been suggested as the most promising choice of dispersants for human and environmental toxicity studies, respectively. This has already been implemented in the CEINT / NIST dispersion protocol (Table 1).

### ***Serum proteins***

In *in vitro* and *in vivo* toxicity testing, biological dispersants are often highly favored over synthetic chemicals. Certain serum proteins, such as bovine serum albumin (BSA), were found to efficiently aid dispersion of some ENP in toxicity testing media. Kim et al. (2011) examined CNT dispersion efficiency and biocompatibility as evaluated by toxicity testing using trypan blue dye exclusion, lactate dehydrogenase (LDH) leakage, and neutral red assays using following dispersants: 0.5% BSA, dimethylsulfoxide (DMSO), 1,2-dipalmitoyl-sn-glycero-3-phosphocholine (DPPC) and 1% Tween 80. All 4 dispersants were found to be biocompatible in the sense of not inducing cytotoxic effects. Their efficiency as dispersants was observed to depend on the type of CNT, i.e. SWCNT or MWCNT. The stability of the dispersions was monitored over 16 weeks and the following descending order from more stable to less stable was established: BSA > Tween 80 > DPPC > DMSO for MWCNT and BSA > DPPC > Tween 80 > DMSO for SWNCT (Kim et al., 2011). Although this indicates that dispersants may have to be chosen based on the material to be

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

dispersed, data also indicate that BSA seems to be an efficient dispersant for CNT. BSA also efficiently improved the dispersibility of TiO<sub>2</sub> ENP in different cell culture media, for which phosphate concentration was determined to be a key factors governing variations in ENP dispersion between different media (Ji et al., 2010). Conformation of the BSA protein, which is pH dependent, was found to influence CNT dispersion efficiency (Edri and Regev, 2008). To enable dispersion of TiO<sub>2</sub>, a required ratio between serum albumin and ENP concentrations was determined by Bihari et al. (2008): TiO<sub>2</sub> in a concentration < 0.2 mg/ml might be stabilized by addition of 1.5 mg/ml serum albumin from human, mouse or bovine, corresponding to approximately 0.15 vol% depending on serum density. The method was found to be applicable resulting in dispersions with agglomerate average diameter < 290 nm for the following ENP: TiO<sub>2</sub> (rutile), ZnO, Ag, SiO<sub>2</sub>, SWNT, MWNT, and diesel SRM2975 particulate matter. In comparison, 2 vol% serum is prescribed for the PROSPECt and ENPRA protocols for dispersing ENP at a concentration of 2.56 mg/ml, whereas only 0.05 wt% sterile-filtered BSA-water is recommended for the same particle concentration in the NANOGENOTOX protocol (Table 1). In both ENPRA and NANOGENOTOX dispersion protocols, the amounts required were based on titration to identify the common best dispersant concentration for TiO<sub>2</sub> (NM-101) and MWCNT (NM-400) and subsequently documented for other ENP to be used in these projects. In addition to BSA other types of serum proteins used for dispersing ENP have been investigated or used, including human serum albumin, mouse serum albumin, mouse serum (Bihari et al., 2008), fetal bovine serum (Ji et al., 2010) and Survanta® natural lung surfactant (Wang et al., 2010a), 10% BAL (bronchoalveolar lavage) fluid from sibling mice mixed into MilliQ-filtered high purity water with 0.9 % NaCl (Jacobsen et al., 2009).

*Natural organic matter*

Natural organic matter (NOM) is a complex matrix of organic materials that plays an important role in the aquatic environment (Sillanpää, 2015). The composition of NOM varies depending on

environmental factors and biological processes but generally contain a large fraction of hydrophobic acids such as humic acids (HA) and fulvic acids (FA). HA and FA differ in water solubility, molecular weight, functional group distribution and elemental composition (Sillanpää, 2015). These substances are large molecules containing hydrophilic and hydrophobic parts including aromatic rings and functional groups such as carboxyls and hydroxyls (Kördel et al. 1997). These structures give NOM a good complexation capacity where various pollutants/metals may bind. Therefore, NOM play a major role in mobility of contaminants through the process of adsorption, aggregation and sedimentation (McCarthy and McKay, 2004), and in bioavailability of metals (Buffle and van Leeuwen, 1992). Due to this property, NOM were shown to act as a stabilizing agent for colloids under certain conditions (Tiller & O'Melia 1993; Wilkinson et al. 1997), and during the last decade, various forms of NOM were also employed to stabilize and control dispersions of ENP. The most commonly used forms of NOM in ecotoxicological research of NP include commercial and isolated HA and FA, and NOM containing different amounts of HA and FA such as the Suwannee River natural organic matter (SR-NOM). NOM addition to ENP dispersion before sonication has been the common practice in most studies.

NOM has been widely used to stabilize a variety of ENP in test medium (Akaighe et al., 2012; Baalousha et al., 2013; Domingos et al., 2013) but only a few studies have used it to stabilize stock suspensions (Cupi, 2015). Manier et al. (2011) investigated the effect of HA on the stability of CeO<sub>2</sub> ENP in stock dispersions prepared in high purity water and different synthetic freshwater media. NOM has been used to stabilize stock suspensions of metal (Ag) and metal oxide (ZnO, TiO<sub>2</sub>) ENP (Cupi et al., 2015). Coating of the ENP with NOM leads to steric and electrostatic repulsion as well as formation of a negative surface charge on the NP, which assist in stabilizing NP dispersions. However, at high NOM concentrations bridging might occur which result in

1  
2  
3  
4 593 sedimentation. HA adsorption to metal oxide ENP has mostly been attributed to electrostatic  
5  
6 594 interaction and ligand exchange (Yang et al. 2009). In test media, SR-NOM and SR-HA (15 mg/L)  
7  
8 595 (Akaighe et al. 2012), and SR-FA (5 mg/L) (Baalousha et al. 2013) were found to produce  
9  
10 596 stabilization of Ag NP at low ionic strength media. Despite the stabilization effect, an important  
11  
12 597 parameter to keep in mind is the implication of NOM presence in the biological effects of the ENP.  
13  
14 598 Presence of NOM reduced the toxicity of Ag NP towards Japanese medaka embryos in dispersion  
15  
16 599 most likely due to coating of NP and decreasing the release of ions (Kim et al. 2013) , and/or  
17  
18 600 complexation with Ag<sup>+</sup> present in the solution (Kim et al. 2013; Gao et al. 2012a). Increasing  
19  
20 601 amounts of NOM were also associated with reduced amounts of Zn<sup>2+</sup> released from ZnO ENP (Li et  
21  
22 602 al. 2013). Previous studies revealed that agglomeration on ZnO ENP was highly dependent on  
23  
24 603 NOM concentration (Zhou and Keller 2010, Domingos et al. 2013). SR-NOM concentrations of 20  
25  
26 604 mg/L were able to decrease agglomeration in ZnO nanoparticles (Domingos et al. 2013). Zhou and  
27  
28 605 Keller (2010) noted that SR-NOM in concentrations >10 mg/L increased the stability of the test  
29  
30 606 system. Humic substances such as SR-HA at 0.2-5 mg/L (Domingos et al. 2009) or 10 mg/L (Thio  
31  
32 607 et al 2011) were also shown to stabilize TiO<sub>2</sub> ENP dispersions. Four mg/L SR-NOM was found to  
33  
34 608 reduce aggregation of TiO<sub>2</sub> in dispersion (Zhang et al. 2009). Similar to test suspensions NOM  
35  
36 609 might also exert an influence on stability of stock suspensions. The affinity of NOM to different  
37  
38 610 ENP depends on chemical composition, chemical structure and present capping agents.  
39  
40 611 Stabilization depends upon type of NOM and concentration; therefore, use of NOM for stabilizing  
41  
42 612 dispersions of different ENP needs to be performed in a case-by-case basis.

43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48 613 ***Poloxamers***

49  
50 614 Polaxamers is a group of non-ionic polymers which are widely used as ENP dispersants (Wang  
51  
52 615 et al., 2012). In the NANOMMUNE stock dispersion protocol 160 ppm Pluronic F126 is added to  
53  
54 616 facilitate dispersion of CNT but not for other ENP (Table 1). The implications of poloxamer

degradation during sonication and subsequent consequences of potential degradation products for biological effects was examined by Wang et al. (2012). This study focused on dispersions of MWCNT using two representative Pluronic surfactants (F-68 and F-127), which are commonly used in dispersing carbon-based ENP. As an alternative to the Pluronic surfactants, the study compared results to dispersions prepared with BSA as dispersant. It was found that the dispersions prepared with Pluronic surfactants became highly cytotoxic after probe as well as bath sonication both in the presence and absence of MWCNT, and depended on sonication time, power, and frequency. This was not the case when BSA was used in dispersing the MWCNT (Wang et al., 2012). Evidence indicates that if poloxamer dispersants are used they need to be added after the sonication step to avoid potential production of toxic degradation products; however, the use of alternative to poloxamers dispersants needs to be considered when possible.

#### ***Other dispersants***

In addition to the already mentioned dispersants other materials have also been added to increase the dispersibility of ENP in aqueous media. Gao et al. (2012b) investigated dispersion methods for carbon-based ENP for ecotoxicity testing. The toxicity of a number of surfactants and tetrahydrofuran (THF) were assessed for their ecotoxicity to green algae *P. subcapitata* and crustacean *C. dubia*. The surfactants include polyvinylpyrrolidone (PVP), gum arabic (GA), sodium dodecylbenzenesulfonate (SDBS), sodium dodecyl sulfate (SDS), sodium cholate (Na-cholate), Triton X-15 and Triton X-100. Based on ecotoxicity studies it was found that Triton X-15, PVP, GA exerted no significant negative impacts on growth of *P. subcapitata* in concentrations up to 1,000 mg/L. Lack of adverse effects to *C. dubia* was only seen for PVP and GA. Hence from an ecotoxicological point of view PVP and GA might be proposed as appropriate surfactants for general ENP dispersion protocols. However their suitability over a range of particle types and toxicity towards different organisms requires further clarification. At the same time potential

1  
2  
3  
4 641 stimulating effects of surfactants also need to be considered. GA is a complex plant exudate with  
5  
6 642 antioxidant properties and was found to enhance growth of *P. subcapitata* compared to control (Gao  
7  
8 643 et al., 2012b). In past studies the use of THF in ENP dispersions for ecotoxicity studies was found  
9  
10 644 to be controversial (Oberdörster, 2004; Zhu et al., 2007; Henry et al., 2007). It has been established  
11  
12 645 that toxic transformation products are formed from THF oxidation causing toxicity artefacts (Henry  
13  
14 646 et al., 2007). Data indicate the need for appropriate controls to monitor negative as well as positive  
15  
16  
17 647 effects of dispersants on test organism responses.  
18  
19  
20 648

21  
22 649 **TOWARDS HARMONIZED DISPERSION PROTOCOLS**  
23

24 650 In the quest of selecting or further developing stock dispersion protocols for ENP it is  
25  
26 651 important to clarify the intended use and purpose of such protocols. For *in vivo* studies, it is  
27  
28 652 important that ENP is well-dispersed and that the vehicle is biologically relevant for the intended  
29  
30 653 exposure route and toxicological evaluations whether they be *in vivo* or *in vitro*. For *in vitro* and  
31  
32 654 aquatic ecotoxicological studies, it could be argued that reaching stable stock dispersions is not  
33  
34 655 essential, because stock dispersions are often diluted in complex media prior to biological testing.  
35  
36 656 Here ENP behavior will anyway change dramatically and stability achieved in the stock dispersion  
37  
38 657 is lost. However, it is postulated that use or further development of appropriate and harmonized  
39  
40 658 stock dispersion protocols is important to:  
41  
42  
43

44 659 - Minimize test artefacts: if ENP are heavily agglomerated in the stock dispersion, the  
45  
46 660 agglomeration state may be ‘transferred’ to the test media where agglomeration may  
47  
48 661 increase further. Further, inappropriate dispersion methods might induce other test artefacts  
49  
50 662 by modifying ENP properties.  
51  
52

53 663 - Ensure quality control: by developing appropriate and transparent dispersion protocols test  
54  
55 664 artefacts may be further minimized and retrospectively evaluated.  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3  
4 665 - Facilitate data comparability: comparability in initial dispersion characteristics may be  
5  
6 666 attained and issues related to stock dispersion preparation is not a confounding factor when  
7  
8 667 comparing results between tests. By not harmonizing stock dispersion procedures an  
9  
10 668 additional level of uncertainty is added.  
11  
12  
13 669 - Enable future quantitative structure–activity relationship (QSAR) model developments:  
14  
15 670 using common dispersion protocols for testing ENP properties including physico-chemical  
16  
17 671 properties, fate and (eco)toxicity might provide more coherent datasets with the possibility  
18  
19 672 of making direct links between outcomes of different tests and ENP properties.  
20  
21  
22 673 - Allowing for establishment of quality criteria: development of technical guidance for ENP  
23  
24 674 dispersion infers that quality and validity criteria are established for the properties of the  
25  
26 675 resulting dispersion such as dispersion stability and state of dispersion.  
27

28 676 It needs to be recognized that reaching harmonization and standardized protocols will always be  
29  
30 677 a compromise between optimum dispersion on one hand and optimum biological/ physiological and  
31  
32 678 material compatibility of the medium and concentrations required in the stock dispersion on the  
33  
34 679 other hand. The advantages and disadvantages of strict harmonization and full flexibility are  
35  
36 680 illustrated in Figure 1. Generic protocols, such as ENPRA and NANOGENOTOX  
37  
38 681 dispersion protocols, are highly relevant for regulatory testing providing the ability to compare test  
39  
40 682 results more directly, whereas tailored dispersion protocols may be more applicable to scientific  
41  
42 683 research questions where the ability to compare between different test results may be of less  
43  
44 684 concern.  
45  
46  
47  
48

49 685 The extent of harmonization, case-by-case adaptation and flexibility are issues that require  
50  
51 686 attention when a specific dispersion protocol is selected or developed, to avoid the situation that a  
52  
53 687 generically optimized protocol is applied to a specific particle type, for which it is unsuitable  
54  
55 688 producing either false positive or false negative toxicological results. Hence, some mechanism is  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

needed within a general protocol to detect and deal with exceptions through specification of performance criteria. Therefore, there is an urgent need to critically evaluate already existing protocols for their general applicability or domain of applicability (type(s) of ENPs, all or specific bioassays).

Based on the information collected through this review, a step-wise approach for developing a tailored dispersion protocol is proposed in Figure 2. This figure highlights the information required and typical points of decision to establish a new or evaluate an existing ENP dispersion protocol. In the first step, the purpose of the experiment/test and intended assay (testing regime such as ecotoxicological or mammalian test system) needs to be clarified with information on the intended exposure route (Figure 2). In addition, performance criteria need to be considered (for example what is considered an acceptable criterion for stability). This is the basis for the choices made in the development of the dispersion protocol. While the step-wise approach shown in Figure 2 describes development of a tailored dispersion protocol for one ENP or a group of ENP, the same steps are required to be considered in a more generic dispersion protocol. However, where a tailored dispersion protocol may be driven by specific performance criteria such as whether stable and well-dispersed dispersions are obtained or no further dispersion efforts are needed, a generic protocol is driven by general performance criteria that all ENP, for which the protocol is considered applicable, will be relatively well dispersed.

As shown in Figure 2, the first steps in development of a tailored dispersion protocol involve collecting basic information on ENP including data particle composition, coating, solubility and hydrophobicity. This information enables informed choices in the subsequent steps of the dispersion protocol. A choice of suitable stock concentration is then made. Ideally this needs to be low as possible to minimize particle agglomeration while at the same time taking into account the concentration requirements in the subsequent tests, for which the dispersion is being prepared. . The

hydrophobicity of the material determines the need for pre-wetting, which is usually done with ethanol although other pre-wetting solutions may also be considered. In case of pre-wetting relevant controls need to be considered and complete evaporation of the pre-wetting agent is required to be ensured. As illustrated in Figure 2 ENP is now mixed into water for which certain quality criteria are defined in the protocol. It is recommended that high quality, ultrapure water with a resistivity of 18.2 MΩ·cm in ENP stock dispersion protocols be employed. The mixing procedure needs to be described explicitly in the protocol as it may influence the resulting dispersion. If the dispersion is not stable upon mechanical mixing, sonication needs to be applied, where probe sonication is considered the most practical, accessible and pragmatic choice from a reproducibility and harmonization point of view. To avoid heating of the sample it is required to be placed in a water bath or ice-water bath during sonication with temperature to be monitored to ensure stable conditions. Sonication time needs to be selected to minimize the energy input, reducing risk of ENP modifications, while still obtaining a disperse particle dispersion. Appropriate sonication controls need to be included to ensure that the ENP is not modified due to this procedure and that no toxic sonication products are formed. Reporting requirements are needed for a detailed description of the sonication procedure including information on specific energy delivered to the sample. If this is still not sufficient to ensure a stable dispersion, different dispersants are required to be considered. The specific choice of dispersant may depend on the testing regime and biological relevancy with serum protein and NOM as common choices for human and environmental toxicity studies, respectively. However, other alternatives exist. An ideal dispersant would aid dispersion stability over a range of particle types, be non-toxic and neither mask or enhance biological activity of the ENP. A suitable dispersant concentration needs to be specified while taking into account that higher concentrations may be counter effective on dispersibility due to bridging. As for pre-wetting

1  
2  
3  
4 736 and sonication, it is important to include controls that capture possible test artefacts induced by  
5  
6 737 dispersants as a result of ENP transformations or modifications.  
7  
8

9 738 **DISCUSSION**  
10

11  
12 739 Several dispersion protocols have already been developed and are used for specific ENP or  
13  
14 740 groups of ENP and biological test systems. However, to ensure the appropriateness of a harmonized  
15  
16 741 dispersion protocol several issues were identified that urgently require additional clarification.  
17  
18 742 Sonication plays critical role in the dispersion preparation, but also represents a key challenge. It is  
19  
20 743 not feasible to give one general recommendation on the sonication procedure that applies to all  
21  
22 744 ENP. It is evident that the higher sonication energy the greater risk of partial oxidation of the ENP  
23  
24 745 and degradation of organic coatings, functionalization and maybe even changes in the structure of  
25  
26 746 compounds such as CNT. From a reproducibility and harmonization point of view it is proposed to  
27  
28 747 use moderate probe sonication as a practical, accessible and pragmatic choice, whilst  
29  
30 748 acknowledging that optimization and additional guidance is needed to optimize and harmonize the  
31  
32 749 procedure between labs. Some guidance on this is offered by Taurozzi et al. (2011; 2012a), which  
33  
34 750 also include suggestions for reporting procedures. However, ways of measuring and reporting the  
35  
36 751 energy effectively delivered to the dispersion and control the effective de-agglomeration efficiency  
37  
38 752 need to be further elaborated to make them practically and routinely applicable. Theoretically,  
39  
40 753 minimizing energy input from sonication may serve to minimize artefacts in biological tests.  
41  
42 754 However, no studies have been identified, which systematically investigate links between  
43  
44 755 sonication procedures and biological effects of the resulting dispersion. Hence, before a final  
45  
46 756 conclusion can be made on the most appropriate sonication methods – especially from a  
47  
48 757 (eco)toxicity testing point of view - well designed studies are needed to investigate the influence of  
49  
50 758 sonication procedures and settings, such as frequency and time, on dispersibility as well as  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

(eco)toxicity. This would include an examination of the cause of any sonication-dependent changes to ENP properties linked to the observed biological effects.

The addition of dispersants is a somewhat controversial issue as it may either mask or enhance the biological activity of the ENP (Cupi et al. 2015). A thorough evaluation of available dispersants is needed to better understand their influence and mode of influence on ENP biological effects, behavior during sonication, including formation of (toxic) degradation products, and during biological exposure such as potential bio-modifications. If addition of dispersants cannot be avoided, methods are needed to take into account modifications of ENP by addition of dispersants when performing biological tests.

In the suggested step-wise approach to develop tailored stock dispersion (Figure 2) the underlying principles were to minimize changes to the pristine ENP in order to reduce the risk of testing artefacts and to obtain a stable dispersion. The actual quantitative (or qualitative) criteria for characterizing a dispersion as 'stable' need to be defined on a case-by-case basis. The diagram is flexible in the sense that other aims or quality criteria could be established based on specific protocol requirements. For example criteria may be included with respect to (mono/poly)dispersibility, particle size distributions, and acceptable physiochemical changes. It could also be argued that, from a regulatory perspective, mono-dispersibility around a small average peak size needs to be included as a criterion reflecting a worst-case situation with higher probability of nano-specific effects. With this in mind the step-wise approach shown in Figure 2 is proposed as a starting point for further discussions and developments on this topic.

## CONCLUSIONS

This study provides an overview of current practice in selected dispersion protocols as well as potential implications for mammalian and ecotoxicity testing. Based on an identification of critical issues and parameters to be taken into account in protocol development for stock dispersion

1  
2  
3  
4 783 preparation, a step-wise approach for tailored dispersion protocols is presented describing the key  
5  
6 784 protocol parameters: particle concentration, pre-wetting, dispersion media, sonication and  
7  
8 785 dispersants. The developed approach provides an adaptable framework which may serve as a  
9  
10 786 starting point for further work towards developments of harmonized dispersion protocol for ENP. It  
11  
12 787 needs to be emphasized that appropriate controls needs to be included in all steps in the dispersion  
13  
14 788 procedure that are likely to entail modifications of the material properties or surface chemistry.  
15  
16 789 Through the analysis, leading to the suggested step-wise approach, a number of issues were  
17  
18 790 identified that require clarification and guidance development, of which the more critical issues  
19  
20 791 relate to the development of:  
21  
22  
23  
24 792 - Measuring and reporting schemes for effective sonication energy input  
25  
26 793 - Links between sonication procedures and biological effects  
27  
28 794 - Methods of taking into account modifications of ENP properties and effects when adding  
29  
30 795 dispersants to ENP suspensions.  
31  
32  
33 796 A common approach to preparation of stock dispersion prior to toxicity testing may improve the  
34  
35 797 possibility of defining meaningful quality control and validity criteria and hence facilitate data  
36  
37 798 comparability, and ultimately enable future QSAR developments by providing more coherent  
38  
39 799 datasets. It is our intention that the proposed step-wise approach be used for development and  
40  
41 800 reporting of future development of protocols for both scientific, regulatory and standardization  
42  
43 801 activities on ENP dispersion protocols.  
44  
45  
46 802

47  
48 803 **Acknowledgements**  
49  
50

51 804 The authors acknowledge the scientific and intellectual input to the ideas summarized in this paper  
52  
53 805 by the contributors to the work on harmonized dispersion protocols within the FP7 projects  
54  
55 806 MARINA (Managing Risks of Nanomaterials, European Commission, Grant Agreement Number  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

807 263215), EnvNano (ERC Starting Grant, Grant Agreement Number 281579) and NANoREG (A  
808 common European approach to the regulatory testing of Manufactured Nanomaterials; European  
809 Commission, Grant Agreement Number 310584). The results in this paper primarily originates from  
810 previous work and the results of the 'Workshop on harmonization of dispersion protocols' held as  
811 part of the MARINA project at the European Commission Joint Research Centre, Ispra, Italy, 22-23  
812 October 2012. In addition to the authors of this paper the participants at the workshop were: Julia  
813 Catalán, Teresa Fernandes, Richard Handy, Alice Harling, Bryan Hellack, Kerstin Hund-Rinke,  
814 José María Navas, and Janeck Scott-Fordsmand. In addition the authors would like to acknowledge  
815 Frank von der Kammer and Craig Poland for their constructive feedback on the workshop  
816 background report.

817

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

818   **References**

819   Akaighe, N., Depner, S. W., Banerjee, S., Sharma, V. K., & Sohn, M. (2012). The effects of  
820   monovalent and divalent cations on the stability of silver nanoparticles formed from direct  
821   reduction of silver ions by Suwannee River humic acid/natural organic matter. *Sci Total Environ*,  
822   441:277-289.

823   Baalousha, M., Nur, Y., Römer, I., Tejamaya, M., & Lead, J. R. (2013). Effect of monovalent and  
824   divalent cations, anions and fulvic acid on aggregation of citrate-coated silver nanoparticles. *Sci*  
825   *Total Environ* 454: 119-131.

826   Badawy, A. M. E., Luxton, T. P., Silva, R. G., Scheckel, K. G., Suidan, M. T., & Tolaymat, T. M.  
827   (2010). Impact of environmental conditions (pH, ionic strength, and electrolyte type) on the surface  
828   charge and aggregation of silver nanoparticles suspensions. *Environ Sci & Techn*, 44:1260-1266.

829   Baun, A., Hartmann, N. B., Grieger, K., & Kusk, K. O. (2008). Ecotoxicity of engineered  
830   nanoparticles to aquatic invertebrates: A brief review and recommendations for future toxicity  
831   testing. *Ecotoxicology*, 17: 387-395.

832   Bihari, P., Vippola, M., Schultes, S., Praetner, M., Khandoga, A. G., Reichel, C. A., Coester, C.,  
833   Tuomi, T., Rehberg M. & Krombach, F. (2008). Optimized dispersion of nanoparticles for  
834   biological in vitro and in vivo studies. *Part Fibre Toxicol* 5:14.

835   Brown, B., & Goodman, J. E. (1965). *High-intensity Ultrasonics: Industrial Applications*. Iliffe  
836   Books.

837   Brown, S. D., & Brown, L. A. S. (2012). Ethanol (EtOH)-induced TGF-β1 and reactive oxygen  
838   species production are necessary for EtOH-induced alveolar macrophage dysfunction and induction  
839   of alternative activation. *Alcoholism: Clin Exp Res* 36: 1952-1962.

840   Buffle, J., & van Leeuwen, H. P. (1992). *Environmental Particles*. Lewis Publishers.

841   Byrne, H. J., Lynch, I., de Jong, W. H., Kreyling, W. G., Loft, S., Park, M. V. D. Z., Riediker, M. &  
842   Warheit, D. (2010). Protocols for assessment of biological hazards of engineered nanomaterials. In  
843   *NanoImpactNet Reports; The European Network on the Health and Environmental Impact of*  
844   *Nanomaterials*. Available online: <http://www.nanoimpactnet.eu/index.php?page=reports> [Accessed  
845   14/7 2015].

846   Caneba, G. T., Dutta, C., Agrawal, V., & Rao, M. (2010). Novel ultrasonic dispersion of carbon  
847   nanotubes. *JMineral Mater Character Eng* 9:165.

848   Capelo-Martínez, J. L. (Ed.). (2008). *Ultrasound in Chemistry: Analytical Applications*. John Wiley  
849   & Sons.

850   Caro, A. A., & Cederbaum, A. I. (2004). Oxidative stress, toxicology, and pharmacology of  
851   CYP2E1\*. *Annu. Rev. Pharmacol. Toxicol.*, 44:27-42.

- Chen, K. L., & Elimelech, M. (2007). Influence of humic acid on the aggregation kinetics of fullerene (C 60) nanoparticles in monovalent and divalent electrolyte solutions. *J Colloid Interface Sci* 309:126-134.
- Choi, J., Kim, H., Kim, P., Jo, E., Kim, H. M., Lee, M. Y., Jin, S.M. & Park, K. (2015). Toxicity of Zinc Oxide Nanoparticles in Rats Treated by Two Different Routes: Single Intravenous Injection and Single Oral Administration. *J Toxicol Environ Health A* 78: 226-243.
- Cronholm, P., Midander, K., Karlsson, H. L., Elihn, K., Wallinder, I. O., & Möller, L. (2011). Effect of sonication and serum proteins on copper release from copper nanoparticles and the toxicity towards lung epithelial cells. *Nanotoxicology*, 5: 269-281.
- Cupi, D. (2015). Engineered Nanoparticle (Eco)Toxicity: Towards Standardized Procedures for Hazard Identification. Ph.D. thesis, Technical University of Denmark, DTU Environment, Kgs. Lyngby.
- Cupi, D., Hartmann, N. B., & Baun, A. (2015). The influence of natural organic matter and aging on suspension stability in guideline toxicity testing of silver, zinc oxide, and titanium dioxide nanoparticles with *Daphnia magna*. *Environ Toxicol Chem* 34: 497-506.
- Domingos, R. F., Rafiei, Z., Monteiro, C. E., Khan, M. A., & Wilkinson, K. J. (2013). Agglomeration and dissolution of zinc oxide nanoparticles: Role of pH, ionic strength and fulvic acid. *Environ Chem* 10: 306-312.
- Domingos, R. F., Tufenkji, N., & Wilkinson, K. J. (2009). Aggregation of titanium dioxide nanoparticles: Role of a fulvic acid. *Environ Sci Technol* 43: 1282-1286.
- Edri, E., & Regev, O. (2008). pH effects on BSA-dispersed carbon nanotubes studied by spectroscopy-enhanced composition evaluation techniques. *Anal Chem* 80: 4049-4054.
- European Commission (EC). (2006). REACH: Regulation (EC) No 1907/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 18 December 2006 concerning the Registration, Evaluation, Authorisation and Restriction of Chemicals (REACH), establishing a European Chemicals Agency, amending Directive 1999/45/EC and repealing Council Regulation (EEC) No 793/93 and Commission Regulation (EC) No 1488/94 as well as Council Directive 76/769/EEC and Commission Directives 91/155/EEC, 93/67/EEC, 93/105/EC and 2000/21/EC. *Off J Eur Union*. L 396, 30.12.2006, pp. 1–849
- European Commission (EC). (2008). CLP: Regulation (EC) No 1272/2008 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 December 2008 on classification, labelling and packaging of substances and mixtures, amending and repealing Directives 67/548/EEC and 1999/45/EC, and amending Regulation (EC) No 1907/2006. *OJ L* 353, 2008, pp. 1–1355.
- Farré, M., Gajda-Schranz, K., Kantiani, L., & Barceló, D. (2009). Ecotoxicity and analysis of nanomaterials in the aquatic environment. *Anal Bioanal Chem* 393: 81-95.



1  
2  
3  
4 887 Feiler, A., Jenkins, P., & Ralston, J. (2000). Metal oxide surfaces separated by aqueous solutions of  
5 888 linear polyphosphates: DLVO and non-DLVO interaction forces.  
6 889 *Phys Chem Chem Phys* 2: 5678-5683.  
7  
8  
9 890 Franklin, N. M., Rogers, N. J., Apte, S. C., Batley, G. E., Gadd, G. E., & Casey, P. S. (2007).  
10 891 Comparative toxicity of nanoparticulate ZnO, bulk ZnO, and ZnCl<sub>2</sub> to a freshwater microalga  
11 892 (*Pseudokirchneriella subcapitata*): the importance of particle solubility. *Environ Sci Technol* 41:  
12 893 8484-8490.  
13  
14 894 Gao, J., Llana, V., Youn, S., Silvera-Batista, C. A., Ziegler, K. J., & Bonzongo, J. C. J. (2012b).  
15 895 Aqueous suspension methods of carbon-based nanomaterials and biological effects on model  
16 896 aquatic organisms. *Environ Toxicol Chem* 31: 210-214.  
17  
18 897 Gao, J., Powers, K., Wang, Y., Zhou, H., Roberts, S. M., Moudgil, B. M., Koopman, B & Barber,  
19 898 D. S. (2012a). Influence of Suwannee River humic acid on particle properties and toxicity of silver  
20 899 nanoparticles. *Chemosphere*, 89: 96-101.  
21  
22 900 Godymchuk, A., Arzamastseva, E., Kuznetsov, D., & Milyaeva, S. (2011). Dispersion of ZrO<sub>2</sub> and  
23 901 Y<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> nanopowders in physiological suspensions. In *Journal of Physics: Conference Series* (Vol.  
24 902 304, No. 1, p. 012043). IOP Publishing.  
25  
26 903 Guiot, C., & Spalla, O. (2012). Stabilization of TiO<sub>2</sub> nanoparticles in complex medium through a  
27 904 pH adjustment protocol. *Environ Sci Technol* 47: 1057-1064.  
28  
29 905 Handy, R.D., Henry, T.B., Scown, T.M., Johnston, B.D., & Tyler, C.R. (2008a). Manufactured  
30 906 nanoparticles: Their uptake and effects on fish-a mechanistic analysis. *Ecotoxicology* 17:396-409  
31  
32 907 Handy, R. D., Owen, R., & Valsami-Jones, E. (2008b). The ecotoxicology of nanoparticles and  
33 908 nanomaterials: Current status, knowledge gaps, challenges, and future needs. *Ecotoxicology*, 17:  
34 909 315-325.  
35  
36 910 Handy, R. D., Cornelis, G., Fernandes, T., Tsyusko, O., Decho, A., Sabo-Attwood, T., Metcalfe, C.,  
37 911 Steevens, J. A., Klaine, S.J. & Koelmans, A. A. (2012a). Ecotoxicity test methods for engineered  
38 912 nanomaterials: Practical experiences and recommendations from the bench. *Environ Toxicol*  
39 913 *Chem* 31: 15-31.  
40  
41 914 Handy, R. D., van den Brink, N., Chappell, M., Mühlhling, M., Behra, R., Dušinská, M., Simpson, P.,  
42 915 Ahtiainen, J., Jha, A. N., Seiter, J., Bednar, A., Kennedy, A., Fernandes, T. F. and Riediker, M.  
43 916 (2012b) Practical considerations for conducting ecotoxicity test methods with manufactured  
44 917 nanomaterials: What have we learnt so far? *Ecotoxicology*, 21: 933-972  
45  
46 918 Hartmann, N. B. (2011). Ecotoxicity of engineered nanoparticles to freshwater organisms. PhD  
47 919 thesis. Kgs. Lyngby, Denmark: Technical University of Denmark (DTU).  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 920 Hartmann, N. B., Engelbrekt, C., Zhang, J., Ulstrup, J., Kusk, K. O., & Baun, A. (2012). The  
921 challenges of testing metal and metal oxide nanoparticles in algal bioassays: Titanium dioxide and  
922 gold nanoparticles as case studies. *Nanotoxicology*, 7: 1082-1094.
- 923 Henry, T. B., Menn, F. M., Fleming, J. T., Wilgus, J., Compton, R. N., & Sayler, G. S. (2007).  
924 Attributing effects of aqueous C60 nano-aggregates to tetrahydrofuran decomposition products in  
925 larval zebrafish by assessment of gene expression. *Environ Health Persp* 115:1059-1065.
- 926 Horst, A. M., Ji, Z., & Holden, P. A. (2012). Nanoparticle dispersion in environmentally relevant  
927 culture media: a TiO<sub>2</sub> case study and considerations for a general approach.  
928 *J Nanopart Res* 14: 1-14.
- 929 Hotze, E. M., Phenrat, T., & Lowry, G. V. (2010). Nanoparticle aggregation: Challenges to  
930 understanding transport and reactivity in the environment. *J Environ Qual* 39: 1909-1924.
- 931 IMLAB. 2013. HIELSCHER: Sonificateur, homogénéiseur à ultrasons, sonotrode URL :  
932 <http://www.imlab.com/fr/hielscher.htm> [Accessed March 31 2015].
- 933 International Organization for Standardization (ISO). (2008). ISO/TS 27687:2008:  
934 Nanotechnologies - Terminology and definitions for nano-objects - Nanoparticle, nanofibre and  
935 nanoplate.
- 936 Jacobsen, N. R., Moller, P., Jensen, K. A., Vogel, U., Ladefoged, O., Loft, S., & Wallin, H. (2009).  
937 Lung inflammation and genotoxicity following pulmonary exposure to nanoparticles in ApoE-/-  
938 mice. *Part Fibre Toxicol*, 6: 2.
- 939 Jacobsen, N. R., Pojano, G., Wallin, H. & Jensen, K. A. (2010). Nanomaterial dispersion protocol  
940 for toxicological studies in ENPRA. Internal ENPRA Project Report. Copenhagen, Denmark: The  
941 National Research Centre for the Working Environment.
- 942 Jensen K. A., Kembouche, Y., Christiansen, E., Jacobsen, N. R., Wallin, H., Guiot, C., Spalla, O. &  
943 Witschger, O. 2011a. Final protocol for producing suitable manufactured nanomaterial exposure  
944 media. Web-Report. The generic NANOGENOTOX dispersion protocol - Standard Operation  
945 Procedure (SOP). October, 2011.
- 946 Jensen K. A., Kembouche, Y., Christiansen, E., Jacobsen, N. R., Wallin, H., Guiot, C., Spalla, O. &  
947 Witschger, O. 2011b. Final protocol for producing suitable manufactured nanomaterial exposure  
948 media – Report The generic NANOGENOTOX dispersion protocol – Standard Operation  
949 Procedure (SOP) and background documentation. July, 2011.
- 950 Jensen K. A., Kembouche, Y., Christiansen, E., N. R., Wallin, H., Guiot, C., Spalla, O., Witschger,  
951 O. (2011c). Deliverable 3: Final protocol for producing suitable MN exposure media. Edited by  
952 Jensen K.A. and Thieret N. June 2011.
- 953 Jensen, K. A., Pojana G. & Bilanicora, D. (2014). Chapter 4: Characterization of manufactured  
954 nanomaterials, dispersion and exposure characterization for toxicological testing. In

1  
2  
3  
4 955 *Nanotoxicology: Progress Towards Nanomedicine*, Eds. N.A. Monteiro-Riviere and C. L. Tran.  
5 956 CRC Press, Taylor and Francis Group, Boca Raton, Florida, USA. pp. 45-73.  
6  
7 957 Ji, Z., Jin, X., George, S., Xia, T., Meng, H., Wang, X., Suarez, E., Zhang, H., Hoek, E. M. V.,  
8 958 Godwin, H., Nel, A. E. & Zink, J. I. (2010). Dispersion and stability optimization of TiO2  
9 959 nanoparticles in cell culture media. *Environ Sci Technol* 44: 7309-7314.  
10  
11 960 Jiang, J., Oberdörster, G., & Biswas, P. (2009). Characterization of size, surface charge, and  
12 961 agglomeration state of nanoparticle dispersions for toxicological studies. *J Nanopart Res* 11: 77-89.  
13  
14 962 Jo, H.J., Choi, J.W., Lee, S.H., & Hong, S.W. 2012. Acute toxicity of Ag and CuO nanoparticle  
15 963 suspensions against *Daphnia magna*: The importance of their dissolved fraction varying with  
16 964 preparation methods. *J Hazard Mater* 227:301-308.  
17  
18 965 Kim, J. S., Song, K. S., Lee, J. H., & Yu, I. J. (2011). Evaluation of biocompatible dispersants for  
19 966 carbon nanotube toxicity tests. *ArchToxicol* 85: 1499-1508.  
20  
21 967 Kim, J. Y., Kim, K. T., Lee, B. G., Lim, B. J., & Kim, S. D. (2013). Developmental toxicity of  
22 968 Japanese medaka embryos by silver nanoparticles and released ions in the presence of humic acid.  
23 969 *Ecotoxicol Environ Saf* 92: 57-63.  
24  
25 970 Kördel, W., Dassenakis, M., Lintelmann, J., & Padberg, S. (1997). The importance of natural  
26 971 organic material for environmental processes in waters and soils (Technical Report).  
27 972 *Pure Appl Chem* 69: 1571-1600.  
28  
29 973 Kosmulski, M. (2009). pH-dependent surface charging and points of zero charge. IV. Update and  
30 974 new approach. *J Colloid Interface Sci* 337: 439-448.  
31  
32 975 Kühnel, D., & Nickel, C. (2014). The OECD expert meeting on ecotoxicology and environmental  
33 976 fate—towards the development of improved OECD guidelines for the testing of nanomaterials.  
34 977 *Sci Total Environ* 472: 347-353.  
35  
36 978 Laban, G., Nies, L. F., Turco, R. F., Bickham, J. W., & Sepúlveda, M. S. (2010). The effects of  
37 979 silver nanoparticles on fathead minnow (*Pimephales promelas*) embryos. *Ecotoxicology*, 19: 185-  
38 980 195.  
39  
40 981 Lee, Y. G., Jeong, J., Raftis, J., & Cho, W. S. (2015). Determination of Adsorption Affinity of  
41 982 Nanoparticles for Interleukin-8 Secreted From A549 Cells by In Vitro Cell-Free and Cell-Based  
42 983 Assays. *J Toxicol Environ Health A* 78:185-195.  
43  
44 984 Li, M., Lin, D., & Zhu, L. (2013). Effects of water chemistry on the dissolution of ZnO  
45 985 nanoparticles and their toxicity to *Escherichia coli*. *Environ Pollut* 173 : 97-102.  
46  
47 986 Li, S., Li, H., Wang, X., Song, Y., Liu, Y., Jiang, L., & Zhu, D. (2002). Super-hydrophobicity of  
48 987 large-area honeycomb-like aligned carbon nanotubes. *J Phys Chem B*, 106: 9274-9276.  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 988 Magdolenova, Z., Lorenzo, Y., Collins, A., & Dusinska, M. (2012). Can standard genotoxicity tests  
989 be applied to nanoparticles?. *Journal of Toxicology and Environmental Health, Part A*, 75(13-15),  
990 800-806.
- 991 Manier, N., Garaud, M., Delalain, P., Aguerre-Chariol, O., & Pandard, P. (2011, July). Behaviour of  
992 ceria nanoparticles in standardized test media—influence on the results of ecotoxicological tests. In  
993 *Journal of Physics: Conference Series* (Vol. 304, No. 1, p. 012058). IOP Publishing.
- 994 McCarthy, J. F., & McKay, L. D. (2004). Colloid transport in the subsurface.  
995 *Vadose Zone J* 3: 326-337.
- 996 Mejia, J., Valembois, V., Piret, J. P., Tichelaar, F., van Huis, M., Masereel, B., Toussaint, O.,  
997 Delhalle, J., Mekhalif, Z. & Lucas, S. (2012). Are stirring and sonication pre-dispersion methods  
998 equivalent for in vitro toxicology evaluation of SiC and TiC?. *J Nanopart Res* 14: 1-18.
- 999 Menard, A., Drobne, D., & Jemec, A. (2011). Ecotoxicity of nanosized TiO<sub>2</sub>. Review of in vivo  
1000 data. *Environ Pollut* 159: 677-684.
- 1001 Morison, K. R., & Hutchinson, C. A. (2009). Limitations of the Weissler reaction as a model  
1002 reaction for measuring the efficiency of hydrodynamic cavitation. *Ultrasonics Sonochem* 16: 176-  
1003 183.
- 1004 NANOMMUNE 2011. Chapter 2.4.1. SOP NANOMMUNE 3.07 v2 Dispersion of nanomaterials  
1005 for in vitro Experiments. In: *Quality Handbook Standard Procedures for Nanoparticle Testing*.  
1006 Krug, H. F. (Ed.). (2011). Nanommune.
- 1007 Oberdörster, E. (2004). Manufactured nanomaterials (fullerenes, C<sub>60</sub>) induce oxidative stress in the  
1008 brain of juvenile largemouth bass. *Environ Health Persp*, 112: 1058-1062.
- 1009 OECD. (1981). Decision of the Council concerning the Mutual Acceptance of Data in the  
1010 Assessment of Chemicals. 12 May 1981 - C(81)30/FINAL. Amended on 26 November 1997 -  
1011 C(97)186/FINAL. Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, Paris.
- 1012 OECD. (2012). Guidance on Sample Preparation and Dosimetry for the Safety Testing of  
1013 Manufactured Nanomaterials. Series on the Safety of Manufactured Nanomaterials No. 36.  
1014 Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, Paris.
- 1015 OECD. (2013). OECD Guidelines for the Testing of Chemicals. Organization for Economic  
1016 Cooperation and Development, Paris. URL:  
1017 <http://www.oecd.org/env/ehs/testing/oecdguidelinesforthetestingofchemicals.htm> [Accessed 31/3  
1018 2015].
- 1019 Ottofuelling, S., Von Der Kammer, F., & Hofmann, T. (2011). Commercial titanium dioxide  
1020 nanoparticles in both natural and synthetic water: Comprehensive multidimensional testing and  
1021 prediction of aggregation behavior. *Environ Sci Technol* 45: 10045-10052.

1  
2  
3  
4 1022 PROSPEcT 2010. Protocol for Nanoparticle Dispersion. 18 May 2010. URL:  
5 1023 [http://www.nanotechia.org/sites/default/files/files/PROSPECT\\_Dispersion\\_Protocol.pdf](http://www.nanotechia.org/sites/default/files/files/PROSPECT_Dispersion_Protocol.pdf) [Accessed  
6 1024 31/3 2015].  
7  
8  
9 1025 Riesz, P., & Kondo, T. (1992). Free radical formation induced by ultrasound and its biological  
10 1026 implications. *Free Radic Biol Med* 13: 247-270.  
11  
12 1027 Römer, I., Gavin, A. J., White, T. A., Merrifield, R. C., Chipman, J. K., Viant, M. R., & Lead, J. R.  
13 1028 (2013). The critical importance of defined media conditions in *Daphnia magna* nanotoxicity  
14 1029 studies. *Toxicol Lett* 223: 103-108.  
15  
16  
17 1030 Roursgaard, M., Poulsen, S. S., Poulsen, L. K., Hammer, M., Jensen, K. A., Utsunomiya, S., Ewing,  
18 1031 R. C., Balic-Zunic, T., Nielsen, G. D. & Larsen, S. T. (2010). Time-response relationship of nano  
19 1032 and micro particle induced lung inflammation. Quartz as reference compound. *Human Exp Toxicol*.  
20 1033 29: 915-933.  
21  
22  
23 1034 Ryan, J. (2004). Endotoxins and cell culture. *Corning Life Sci Tech Bull* 1-8.  
24  
25 1035 Salager, J. L. (1994). Interfacial phenomena in dispersed systems. *FIRP Booklet*, 120.  
26  
27 1036 Schneider, T., & Jensen, K. A. (2009). Relevance of aerosol dynamics and dustiness for personal  
28 1037 exposure to manufactured nanoparticles. *J Nanoparticle Research*, 11: 1637-1650.  
29  
30 1038 Seitz, F., Bundschuh, M., Rosenfeldt, R. R., & Schulz, R. (2013). Nanoparticle toxicity in *Daphnia*  
31 1039 *magna* reproduction studies: The importance of test design. *Aquat Toxicol* 126: 163-168.  
32  
33 1040 Sillanpää, M. (2015). Chapter 1 - General Introduction, In Sillanpää, M. (ed), Natural Organic  
34 1041 Matter in Water. Characterization and Treatment Methods, Butterworth-Heinemann, p. 1-15.  
35  
36  
37 1042 Skjolding, L.M., Winther-Nielsen, M. & Baun, A. (2014). Trophic transfer of differently  
38 1043 functionalized zinc oxide nanoparticles from crustaceans (*Daphnia magna*) to zebrafish (*Danio*  
39 1044 *rerio*). *Aquatic Toxicology*, 157:101-108.  
40  
41 1045 Snyder-Talkington, B. N., Qian, Y., Castranova, V., & Guo, N. L. (2012). New perspectives for in  
42 1046 vitro risk assessment of multiwalled carbon nanotubes: application of coculture and bioinformatics.  
43 1047 *Journal of Toxicology and Environmental Health, Part B*, 15:468-492.  
44  
45  
46 1048 Tantra, R., Schulze, P., & Quincey, P. (2010). Effect of nanoparticle concentration on zeta-potential  
47 1049 measurement results and reproducibility. *Particuology*, 8: 279-285.  
48  
49 1050 Tantra, R., Sikora, A., Hartmann, N. B., Sintes, J. R., & Robinson, K. N. (2014). Comparison of the  
50 1051 effects of different protocols on the particle size distribution of TiO<sub>2</sub> dispersions. *Particuology*  
51 1052 19:35-44.  
52  
53  
54 1053 Taurozzi, J. S., Hackley, V. A., & Wiesner, M. R. (2011). Ultrasonic dispersion of nanoparticles for  
55 1054 environmental, health and safety assessment-issues and recommendations. *Nanotoxicology*, 5:  
56 1055 711-729.  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1056 Taurozzi, J. S., Hackley, V. A., Weisner, M. R. (2012a). NIST Special Publication 1200-1.  
1057 Reporting Guidelines for the Preparation of Aqueous Nanoparticle Dispersions from Dry Materials.  
1058 NIST Special Publication. U.S. Department of Commerce / National Institute of Standards and  
1059 Technology.
- 1060 Taurozzi, J.S., Hackley, V.A., Weisner, M.R. (2012b). NIST Special Publication 1200-2.  
1061 Preparation of Nanoparticle Dispersions from Powdered Material Using Ultrasonic Disruption.  
1062 NIST Special Publication. U.S. Department of Commerce / National Institute of Standards and  
1063 Technology.
- 1064 Taurozzi, J. S., Hackley, V. A., Weisner, M. R. (2012c). NIST Special Publication 1200-3.  
1065 Preparation of a Nanoscale TiO<sub>2</sub> Aqueous Dispersion for Toxicological or Environmental Testing.  
1066 NIST Special Publication. Version 1.2 ed.: U.S. Department of Commerce / National Institute of  
1067 Standards and Technology.
- 1068 Taurozzi, J. S., Hackley, V. A., Weisner, M. R. (2012d). NIST Special Publication 1200-4.  
1069 Preparation of Nanoscale TiO<sub>2</sub> Dispersions in Biological Test Media for Toxicological Assessment.  
1070 NIST Special Publication. Version 1.1 ed.: U.S. Department of Commerce / National Institute of  
1071 Standards and Technology.
- 1072 Taurozzi, J. S., Hackley, V. A., Weisner, M. R. (2013). NIST Special Publication 1200-5r1.  
1073 Preparation of Nanoscale TiO<sub>2</sub> Dispersions in an Environmental Matrix for Eco-Toxicological  
1074 Assessment. NIST Special Publication. Version 1.2 ed.: U.S. Department of Commerce / National  
1075 Institute of Standards and Technology.
- 1076 Thio, B. J. R., Zhou, D., & Keller, A. A. (2011). Influence of natural organic matter on the  
1077 aggregation and deposition of titanium dioxide nanoparticles. *J Hazard Mater* 189: 556-563.
- 1078 Thomas, C. R., George, S., Horst, A. M., Ji, Z., Miller, R. J., Peralta-Videa, J. R., Xia, T., Pokhrel,  
1079 S., Mädler, L., Gardea-Torresdey, J.L., Holden, P.A., Keller, A.A., Lenihan, H.S., Nel, A.E., &  
1080 Zink, J. I. (2011). Nanomaterials in the environment: from materials to high-throughput screening  
1081 to organisms. *ACS Nano*, 5: 13-20.
- 1082 Tiller, C. L., & O'Melia, C. R. (1993). Natural organic matter and colloidal stability: Models and  
1083 measurements. *Colloids and Surfaces A: Physicochem Eng Aspects*, 73: 89-102.
- 1084 Truong, L., Saili, K. S., Miller, J. M., Hutchison, J. E., & Tanguay, R. L. (2012). Persistent adult  
1085 zebrafish behavioral deficits results from acute embryonic exposure to gold nanoparticles. *Comp*  
1086 *Biochem Physiol Part C: Toxicol Pharmacol* 155: 269-274.
- 1087 von der Kammer, F., Ottofuelling, S., & Hofmann, T. (2010). Assessment of the physico-chemical  
1088 behavior of titanium dioxide nanoparticles in aquatic environments using multi-dimensional  
1089 parameter testing. *Environ Pollut* 158: 3472-3481.

1  
2  
3  
4 1090 Wang, L., Castranova, V., Mishra, A., Chen, B., Mercer, R. R., Schwegler-Berry, D., &  
5 1091 Rojanasakul, Y. (2010a). Dispersion of single-walled carbon nanotubes by a natural lung surfactant  
6 1092 for pulmonary in vitro and in vivo toxicity studies. *Part Fibre tToxicol* 7: 31.  
7  
8  
9 1093 Wang, L., Mercer, R. R., Rojanasakul, Y., Qiu, A., Lu, Y., Scabilloni, J. F., Wu, N. & Castranova,  
10 1094 V. (2010b). Direct fibrogenic effects of dispersed single-walled carbon nanotubes on human lung  
11 1095 fibroblasts. *Journal of Toxicology and Environmental Health, Part A*, 73(5-6), 410-422.  
12  
13 1096 Wang, R., Hughes, T., Beck, S., Vakil, S., Li, S., Pantano, P., & Draper, R. K. (2012). Generation  
14 1097 of toxic degradation products by sonication of Pluronic® dispersants: implications for nanotoxicity  
15 1098 testing. *Nanotoxicology*, 7: 1272-1281.  
16  
17  
18 1099 Weyman, G. S., Rufli, H., Weltje, L., Salinas, E. R., & Hamitou, M. (2012). Aquatic toxicity tests  
19 1100 with substances that are poorly soluble in water and consequences for environmental risk  
20 1101 assessment. *Environ Toxicol Chem* 31: 1662-1669.  
21  
22  
23 1102 Wilkinson, K. J., Negre, J. C., & Buffle, J. (1997). Coagulation of colloidal material in surface  
24 1103 waters: the role of natural organic matter. *J Contaminant Hydrol* 26: 229-243.  
25  
26 1104 Yang, K., Lin, D., & Xing, B. (2009). Interactions of humic acid with nanosized inorganic oxides.  
27 1105 *Langmuir*, 25: 3571-3576.  
28  
29 1106 Zhang, Y., Chen, Y., Westerhoff, P., & Crittenden, J. (2009). Impact of natural organic matter and  
30 1107 divalent cations on the stability of aqueous nanoparticles. *Water Res* 43: 4249-4257.  
31  
32 1108 Zhou, D., & Keller, A. A. (2010). Role of morphology in the aggregation kinetics of ZnO  
33 1109 nanoparticles. *Water Res* 44: 2948-2956.  
34  
35  
36 1110 Zhu, M., Wang, H., Keller, A. A., Wang, T., & Li, F. (2014). The effect of humic acid on the  
37 1111 aggregation of titanium dioxide nanoparticles under different pH and ionic strengths. *Science of the*  
38 1112 *Total Environment*, 487, 375-380.  
39  
40 1113 Zhu, S., Oberdörster, E., & Haasch, M. L. (2006). Toxicity of an engineered nanoparticle (fullerene,  
41 1114 C 60) in two aquatic species, *Daphnia* and fathead minnow.  
42 1115 *Mar Environ Res* 62:S5-S9.  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**Table 1.** Overview of some existing protocols for dispersing ENPs in aquatic media.

<b>Project / organisation</b>	<b>CEINT / NIST (1200-3)</b>	<b>NANOGENOTOX</b>	<b>NANOIMMUNE</b>	<b>PROSPECt</b>	<b>ENPRA</b>
<b>Year of publication</b>	2012	2011	2011	2010	2010
<b>Testing regime</b>	Toxicity (in vitro) and ecotoxicity (acute) testing	Toxicity testing (in vivo and in vitro)	Immunotoxicity testing (in vivo and in vitro)	Ecotoxicity (and toxicity) testing	Toxicity testing (in vivo and in vitro)
<b>ENP(s) used in protocol development</b>	TiO <sub>2</sub>	SiO <sub>2</sub> , TiO <sub>2</sub> , MWCNT	e.g. TiO <sub>2</sub> , ZnO, SiO <sub>2</sub> , CNTs and various Fe ENPs	CeO <sub>2</sub> , ZnO	TiO <sub>2</sub> , ZnO uncoated, ZnO coated, Ag, MWCNT
<b>Stock concentration (mg/ml)</b>	0.5 – 20 mg/ml	2.56 mg/ml	1 mg/ml (general), 0.25 mg/ml (CNTs)	1 mg/ml diluted to 0.015 mg/ml (CeO <sub>2</sub> ), 2.56 mg/ml (coated ZnO)	2.56 mg/ml
<b>Volume of dispersion medium</b>	50 mL	6 mL	-	Approximately 15 mL (CeO <sub>2</sub> ) 4-6 mL (coated ZnO)	6 mL
<b>Pre-wetting</b>	No	Yes, generically with 0.5 vol% ethanol for all ENPs	No	Yes, with DI water for CeO <sub>2</sub> , and with 0.5 vol% ethanol for coated ZnO	Yes, with 0.5 vol% ethanol for both coated and uncoated ZnO
<b>Dispersion media</b>	Type 1 biological grade (sterile) DI water	Purest water available (e.g. Nanopure and MilliQ water)	Ultrapure water	DI water (CeO <sub>2</sub> ), Highest standard DI water available and filtration through a filter ≤ 0.45 µm (coated ZnO)	0.45 µm filtered DI water or higher quality



<i>Resistivity</i>	18 MΩ·cm	Up to 18.2 MΩ·cm, (Nanopure Diamond UV Water ), 18.2 MΩ·cm (MilliQ water)	-	~ 18 MΩ·cm	-
<i>Pyrogens</i>	Absence of endotoxin contamination	< 0.001 EU/ml (Nanopure Diamond UV Water), < 0.02 Endotoxin Units/ml (MilliQ water)	Lipopolysaccharides < 0.25 ng/ml	-	-
<i>Sonication</i>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<i>Means of sonication</i>	Probe sonication	Probe sonication	Probe sonication (SiO <sub>2</sub> and metal oxides). Ultrasonic bath for CNTs	Probe sonication	Probe sonication
<i>Sonicator settings</i>	50 W, pulsed operation mode (80% on / 20% off)	400 W at preferably 10% amplitude	-	130 W at 90% amplitude (CeO <sub>2</sub> ) 400W (coated ZnO)	400 W at 10% amplitude
<i>Time</i>	15 min	16 min (12 min for instruments that cannot go below 20% amplitude)	3x20 sec (5 sec break) (SiO <sub>2</sub> ), 2 min (metal oxides), 2x10 min w/ vortex (CNTs)	20 sec (CeO <sub>2</sub> ), 16 min (coated ZnO)	16 min
<i>Cooling</i>	On ice water bath	On ice water bath	On ice (SiO <sub>2</sub> and metal oxides)	On ice water bath (optional for CeO <sub>2</sub> )	On ice water bath
<b>Dispersant in stock dispersion</b>	No	0.05 %w/v Bovine Serum . It is recommended that the	160 ppm Pluronic F126 (CNTs), not added for	For toxicity testing: 2 vol% mouse serum (in vivo) or 2%	2 vol% serum (e.g. bovine or mouse)

		albumin type is adjusted according to the species tested	other materials.	serum of choice (in vitro)	
<b>Subsequent addition of stabilising / dispersing agents</b>	Bovine Serum Albumin (Toxicological testing, NIST 1200-4) or Humic Acid (Environmental Testing, NIST 1200-5r1).	-	-	-	-
<b>Recommended maximum time between stock preparation to use in test</b>	48 hours (stability validated)	1 hour (stability validated). Can be re-dispersed by shaking	Max. 1 day. If the time between stock preparation and use in test exceeds 30 min. then the stock should be sonicated prior to dilution in test media	Stable for 1 hour but immediate use is recommended	1 hour (stability validated). Can be re-dispersed by shaking
<b>Quality assurance</b>	LDS/DLS/XDC and pH	DLS and qualitative support from optical microscopy	Analytical ultracentrifugation/laser diffraction/DLS, zeta potential, and measurements of dissolved ions	DLS	DLS and qualitative support from optical microscopy

**Table 12.** Advantages and disadvantages of common sonicator types.

Sonicator type	Relative Advantages	Relative Disadvantages
<b>Bath (indirect)</b>	Low risk of contamination Larger volumes can be handled Good thermal control is possible	Low rate energy output Poor control of delivered energy
<b>Probe (horn) sonication (direct)</b>	High rate of energy output Good control of delivered energy Good thermal control is possible	Contamination from probe (sonotrode) tip erosion Potential risk if cross-contamination Smaller volumes can be processed
<b>Cup horn (indirect)</b>	Less risk of contamination High rate of energy output High level of thermal control possible	Availability in general and cost Smaller volumes can be processed





Figure 1. Illustration of different approaches to harmonisation of dispersion protocols. The protocol can either be prescriptive giving strict specifications (e.g. ENP concentrations, sonicator type, model and setting, mandatory pre-wetting step) or it can provide the overall framework but allow more flexibility and individual choices. At the same time, a protocol can be more general (with a specific range of applicability given) or it can be tailored to a specific ENP (or a group of ENPs). Harmonization and standardisation of dispersion protocols will always be a compromise between optimum dispersion for specific ENPs on one hand and compatibility between test systems and ENPs on the other hand.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



## SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Table S1. Examples of the influence of sonication on biological effects in ecotoxicity (and toxicity) testing

Nanoparticle type	Type of sonication	Type of organism / cell	Influence of sonication	Other observations	Reference
<b>CuO</b>	Bath (Intersonic, IS-2, 300W, 35 kHz)	<i>Nitellopsis obtusa</i> (macrophytic algae) <i>Chlorella</i> (microphytic algae) <i>Thamnocephalus platyurus</i> (shrimp) <i>Brachionus calyciflorus</i> (rotifer)	No <u>substantial</u> differences in toxicity between sonicated and non-sonicated dispersions. However sonicated dispersion was more toxic than non-sonicated dispersion in the case of <i>N. obtusa</i> , and the opposite situation was found for <i>B. calyciflorus</i> )	Re-agglomeration was observed immediately after sonication within 15 s, and the particle size distributions of nonsonicated and sonicated 30-mg/L nCuO dispersions practically did not differ after 5 min	[1]
<b>Ag</b>	Bath (Branson Ultrasonics, 2510 Ultra sonic cleaner, 15 kHz for 1.5 h)	<i>P. promelas</i> embryos	A short sonication period (5 min) just prior to testing resulted in a significant increase in mortality compared to exposure to particles that were just stirred. Similar amounts of dissolved Ag were released from the Sigma Ag NPs tested regardless if solutions were stirred or sonicated ( $p > 0.05$ ), but with concentrations increasing significantly with increasing concentrations (all comparisons $p > 0.05$ )	Sonication resulted in a decrease in the formation of aggregates compared to solutions that were only stirred, regardless of NP size.	[2]
<b>TiO<sub>2</sub></b>	Probe sonication (QSonica, Sonicator 4000, Newton, CT) for 5 minutes at 20 kHz, 20mm, 0.5 inch Ti horn)	<i>H. azteca</i>	Sonication of TiO <sub>2</sub> NP stock solutions increases toxicity compared to stirred solutions. Also, in general, animals exposed to sonicated TiO <sub>2</sub> showed significantly lower dry weight than stirred groups.	-	[3]
<b>CeO<sub>2</sub></b>	Probe (1 minute / 70 watts) Versus magnetic stirring (vigorous, 24h)	<i>Daphnia magna</i> <i>Ceriodaphnia dubia</i> <i>Pseudokirchneriella subcapitata</i>	For <i>C. dubia</i> : higher toxicity after exposure to the probe sonicated dispersions compared to stirred dispersions. For <i>P. subcapitata</i> : although different dispersal protocol leads to different agglomerate size of nCeO <sub>2</sub> , the algae growth inhibition were similar For <i>D. magna</i> : no inhibition of the mobility was recorded independent of media and dispersion method	The use of probe sonication as a dispersal methods and the addition of HA (2 mg.L <sup>-1</sup> , TOC), were the optimal protocol to produce small and consistent particles sizes in dispersions, with a reasonable stability over the exposure period. Moreover this protocol appears to be the most reproducible methods to disperse the ceria nanopowder in the different aqueous media.	[4]

Cu	Probe (Sonifier B12 power supply with converter and standard microtip from Branson Sonic Power Company (USA). Approximate output of 14 W in a 2 mL dispersion)	A549 cells (lung epithelial cells)	Significant difference ( $p > 0.001$ ) in release of Cu from Cu ENPs. All particles were dissolved at sonicated conditions, whereas ca. 65% of the particles were dissolved in the non-sonicated particle dispersion. Sonication of the particle dispersion also influenced the induced toxicity when compared to the non-sonicated samples ( $p > 0.001$ ).  NB! A higher extent of released Cu for sonicated particle dispersions compared to nonsonicated dispersions does not explain well observed differences in toxicity. The differences in size of particles and agglomerates is a more plausible explanation	Visual observations clearly revealed that sonication rapidly changed the appearance of the cell medium containing visible large particle agglomerates to a dark brownish appearance with no visible large particle agglomerates	[5]
----	--	------------------------------------	--	---	-----

References

[1]: Manusadzianas, L., Caillet, C., Fachetti, L., Gylytė, B., Grigutyte, R., Jurkonienė, S., ... & Férard, J. F. (2012). Toxicity of copper oxide nanoparticle suspensions to aquatic biota. *Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry*, 31(1), 108-114.

[2]: ( Laban, G., Nies, L. F., Turco, R. F., Bickham, J. W., & Sepúlveda, M. S. (2010). The effects of silver nanoparticles on fathead minnow (*Pimephales promelas*) embryos. *Ecotoxicology*, 19(1), 185-195.

[3]: Malhi, G. S. (2012). The Chronic Toxicity of Titanium Dioxide Nanoparticles to the Freshwater Amphipod *Hyaella azteca*. MSc. Theseis, Wilfrid Laurier University. URL: <http://scholars.wlu.ca/etd/839/> [accessed 31/03/2015]

[4]: Manier, N., Garaud, M., Delalain, P., Aguerre-Chariol, O., & Pandard, P. (2011). Behaviour of ceria nanoparticles in standardized test media–influence on the results of ecotoxicological tests. In *Journal of Physics: Conference Series* (Vol. 304, No. 1, p. 012058). IOP Publishing.

[5]: Cronholm, P., Midander, K., Karlsson, H. L., Elihn, K., Wallinder, I. O., & Möller, L. (2011). Effect of sonication and serum proteins on copper release from copper nanoparticles and the toxicity towards lung epithelial cells. *Nanotoxicology*, 5(2), 269-281.